REMARKS

On Several

Late Writings,

Publiſh'd in Engliſh by the

SOCINIANS:

Wherein

Is ſhow'd the inſufficiency and weakneſs of their *Anſwers* to the Texts brought againſt them by the *Orthodox*.

IN FOUR

LETTERS.

Written at the Requeſt of a *Socinian* Gentleman.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

By *H. DE LUZANCY*, B. D.
Vic. of *Dovere*. and *Harwich*.

LONDON,
Printed by *Tho. Warren*, for *Thomas Bennet*, at the *Half-Moon* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1696.

REMARKS

On Several

Late Writings,

Publish'd in English by the

SOCINIANS:

Wherein

Is show'd the insufficiency and weakness of their *Answers* to the Texts brought against them by the *Orthodox*.

IN FOUR

LETTERS.

Written at the Request of a *Socinian* Gentleman.

By H. DE LUZANCY, B. D.
Vic. of *Dyers*, and *Harwich*.

LONDON,
Printed by Tho. *Warren*, for *Thomas Bennet*, at the *Half-Moon* in St. *Paul's* Church-Yard, 1696.

THE PREFACE.

THE design of the following Letters was to instruct a private Gentleman, who by reading Socinian Books, had got a mighty prejudice against the Sacred Doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and Incarnation. He desir'd that he might have the liberty to communicate my Papers to some of his Friends of that perswasion. But this being liable to many inconveniences, it was thought much better at once to expose them to publick view. Whether he will be convinc'd by these Writings must be left to God, who best knows the ways of working upon the minds of men. Whether there is matter enough to convince him, is left to the judgment of the World?

The general means to clear a Controversy are Reason, and Authority. I humbly conceive, that the first has nothing to do in this dispute. For how can we argue from the Principles of natural reason in a point wholly Divine and Supernatural? and how can the Philosopher of this World conclude with any certainty, in that which is above all the inquiries, and decisions of Philosophy. I ever thought the Socinians extreamly in the wrong, with their

pretended contradictions in the belief of our Holy Mysteries, and the Letter to both the Universities, much the worst of all their Writings: It being certainly neither just, nor candid, to use Topicks, though never so ingeniously turn'd, altogether foreign to the matter in dispute; and to give an air of probability to that which when truly stated, and consider'd, is of another nature than the thing propos'd to us. I take it for granted, even by these Gentlemen themselves, that Faith and Reason are two different things; and consequently that that which is the object of Faith, cannot be the object of Reason. Of what use then can those Arguments be which are call'd Demonstrations against the Doctrines of the Holy Trinity, and Incarnation? Those perpetual descants upon the impossibility of Three being One, and One Three; of the same substance unbegotten, begotten, and proceeding; of a part of God being incarnate, and another not incarnate: All this, and ten thousand Objections more are a fallacy, and an imposition on Mankind. The case here being of another nature, not tryable at the Bar of our corrupt Reason; but call'd to another and a more infallible Tribunal.

On the other side, though it looks much like Charity and Condescension; yet it is certainly an Inadvertency, to have pretended to answer these Gentlemen in their own way, and to run with them upon the same false scent, of reasoning on those things which we ought only to believe, and adore. The Socinians may write till Doomsday to prove the Unreasonableness; and their charitable and learned

Answerers

Answerers may do the same, to prove the Reasonableness of our Christian Doctrine; I mean, keeping still within the compass of natural reason; and yet the great truth will never be clear'd; because indeed neither of them embrace the true Method to clear it.

The way then of Authority *is both the plainest and the safest. It has that advantage, that the other is even resolv'd into it. For there is nothing so highly rational as a submission of our Reason to an Authority which all rules own to be infallible. We all agree that the Divine Scriptures are the rule of our Faith. We all acknowledge them to be* the word of God. *and this very name commands naturally, and of it self a veneration, which no human Writings, though of never so much strength and clearness, can force from us. It is then from thence, and only from thence, that we ought to reason, and conclude in this Sacred Controversy. The consent of the whole Christian World must be a strong inducement to a* modest Socinian *to mistrust all his Arguments. To oppose all that has been, and is Great and Good in the Church of God, in a point of Faith, is too much for the most presuming Disputant. But when the Authority of God, speaking in those Scriptures, which we all contend to be the Revelation which he has made of himself to us, is superadded to the universal consent of the Church, all the reasons which we can pretend to oppose to this, ought to be no more to men of sence, than talk and noise.*

The Church asserts the Unity of the Divine Nature, in which three distinct, and equally adorable

Persons

Persons subsist, The Father, The Son, and the Holy Ghost, of which the second was incarnate, and in the fullness of time became Man. To say that this is false, because incomprehensible, is a lame and silly consequence. Nor is it sufferable to reject the belief of these Mysteries, because our poor, narrow, and corrupt Reason is pleas'd to start contradictions in a subject so far above our capacity; and to say, as those Gentlemen urge vehemently, that we cannot believe that of which we can have no notion, or Idea, is much worse; since, besides that we have little or no knowledge at all of the ways, operations, and manner of Existence of an Infinite Being; to suppose a notion or an Idea of the thing propos'd is to destroy Faith, which Heb. 11. 1. is the Evidence of things not seen: that is, an assurance and certainty of that which is imperceptible to us, because above the reach of our understanding; supplying by the Authority of the Revelation, that notion or Idea of which these Gentlemen argue an absolute necessity.

The only way then to satisfy our selves is to know what the Scripture teaches concerning this. For if the Church speaks the language of the Scripture, it speaks as God has taught it; and to speak after God is the most certain and excellent way of speaking in the World. The Challenge of the great Athanasius to the Arrians, and of St. Austin to the Heretick of his time, was the most reasonable Proposition in nature to a people who own'd Christianity; and that is, that laying aside human reasonings, and relying upon the veracity of the Divine Oracles,

they

they should inquire, not what man propos'd, but what God has say'd in the matter. *If the Scripture is positive that God is one; and yet asserts the Father to be God, the Son to be God, and the Holy Ghost to be God: If it says that the Son has taken our nature upon him; The Church speaks as the Scripture has taught, and the Doctrine of the* Trinity *and* Incarnation, *is the Doctrine of the Church; because it is first that of the Scripture.*

Being perswaded then that the dispute must at last be put upon that Issue; and sensible that any thing else that is propos'd of both sides, though it shews the great parts and abilities of the Disputants, can yet give no solid satisfaction; I have endeavour'd to walk in the old way, and aim'd at these two things. First, To prove the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour, and of the Holy Spirit, which proof really implies all the rest. For if the Son *is God, and* the Holy Ghost *is God, The great objection is answer'd, that Three Divine Persons destroy the Unity of God, which is the state of the question. Since if it does appear that it is so; there is a* Trinity *of Persons without a destruction of that Unity which is inseparable from the Divine Nature.*

Secondly, I have attempted to shew the insufficiency of these Gentlemen's Answers to those substantial Texts on which our Belief rests. For I must beg leave to say, that it is almost incredible, that such thin, ill-built, unwary Answers, should drop from Persons undoubtedly of great Learning: and it is a strong confirmation of those very proofs, when mighty Adversaries have so little to say to them.

If

If the whole is not manag'd as it should be; I hope that the Sacred Cause which I maintain, will not suffer for it; and if the Person, for whose sake these Letters are written, is not satisfy'd by what I have done; It is his and my Misfortune, that I can do no better. Whatsoever is in these Papers is with the humblest submission offer'd to the Judgment and Censure of the Church of England.

THE

THE
First LETTER.

SIR,

I Have read the Books which you were pleas'd to lend me, with as much application as I could; and am now to diſcharge my promiſe of giving you my ſence of them. I confeſs it is ſomewhat a hard Province, and in particular to me, who ever was an Enemy to diſputes in Religion; and fully perſwaded, that the only way to unite diſſenting Chriſtians, is, not ſo much to diſpute, as to live up to the duties of a Religion, which we all confeſs to be as the God who gave it, holy and juſt. This would have oblig'd me to be ſilent: But ſince it has pleas'd God to make you a part of my Care, and that you deſire me to reſolve your Doubts againſt the Catholick Doctrine, which you ſay you are moſt willing to embrace, if you can be ſatisfied that it is true; I will endeavour to give you the beſt information I can, leaving all to the candor of your nature, and to that ſolid judgment which I have obſerv'd in you.

I deſign'd once to have follow'd every tract which you put in my hands: But I was diſſwaded from it, *Firſt*, By the length and tedioufneſs of the work. *Secondly*, By obſerving that your Friends ſay almoſt the ſame things over and over again: Theſe Gentlemen having the way to turn the ſame Argument into ſeveral ſhapes, and put their thoughts every day in a new dreſs.

As to their abilities, their greateſt Enemies muſt confeſs that they are not ordinary. They are Men of learning: Their ſtile is correct, exact and florid. They have the misfortune of *Origen*, of whom an Ancient ſaid, that *Ubi bene, nemo melius, ubi male, nemo pejus.* None can do better, where they are in the right: none worſe, where they are in the wrong.

I find alſo that ſometimes thoſe fine Pens are dipt in Gall; that they are not ſparing of the ſharpeſt invectives; and that laying aſide their fine and Gentlemen-like way of writing, they become Mortals again, and grow acquainted with all ſorts of Sarcaſms. The Preface to Mr. *Milbourn* is ſharp and ſcurrilous. The Reflexion on both the Univerſities, and *the skill of the Bottle*, do not much grace the Diſpute. The Trinity of *Marcus Tullius Cicero*, by reaſon of an illuſtration of the word *perſon* by Dr. *Wallis*; The Trinity of the *Mobile*, of ignorant and lazy Doctors; The Sabellian Targonry of Dr. *South*, *Conſider. on the Explic. of the Doctr. of the Holy Trin. pag.* 11. might have been laid aſide, and the pretended Wit that it amounts to, reſerv'd for a better uſe.

Give me leave alſo to admire, how men who are willing to be thought pious as well as learned, can turn ſolid Reaſonings into Railleries, and diſprove an Argument by ridiculing it. Indeed *Tertullian* in his Apologetick, asks, whether he ſhall laugh at the vanity of the Heathen and their Rites, or whether he ſhall reproach them with their blindneſs? *Rideam vanitatem, aut exprobrem cæcitatem*? But it is quite another thing, when a Writer pretends to anſwer men of Reaſon and Learning! and when the Objections are really ſtrong and ſolid. Not to multiply inſtances, I will only point at that in a Letter of Reſolution, *pag.* 3, 4, 5. The Author had objected to himſelf, that the *Trinity*, and *Incarnation* are incomprehenſible Myſteries, and that when the matter is of

of meer Revelation, it is not to be judg'd by either Reason or Sence. He propoſes ſeveral things which are really above both: This is anſwer'd by making a Myſtery of that which is none, the aſſertion of Chriſt, *Joh.* 15. 1. *I am the true Vine*; and the notion of *God-Man*, is ridicul'd by that of Chriſt-Vine or Vine-man, or Viney man. Dr. *Wallis* having aſſerted, That the three Perſons of the Holy Trinity are more than three divine Attributes, and that though perhaps their Perſonality may not ſo exactly be underſtood by the notion of Perſonality which we are acquainted with in created Beings; yet there is certainly ſomewhat more than Attributes. They make a perpetual deſcant upon *three Somewhats*, or *three I know not what's*, the *Unreaſon. of the Doctr. of the Trin. pag.* 5, 6. Dr. *South* in his Animadverſions, *Chap.* 8. *pag.* 241. having explain'd the Modes of Being, and having told us, "That a Mode is properly a certain habitude of "ſome Being, Eſſence, or Thing, whereby the ſaid "Eſſence, or Being is determin'd to ſome particular "ſtate or condition, which barely of it ſelf it ſhould "not be determin'd to—— That a Mode in things "ſpiritual and immaterial *ſeems* to have much the like "reference to ſuch kinds of Beings, as a poſture has "to a body, to which it gives ſome difference, or "diſtinction, without adding any new Entity or Being "to it: and having told us alſo *pag.* 242. *lin.* 4. that *no one thing can agree both to God and the Creature by a perfect Univocation*, which the Anſwerer has, I hope, not wilfully overlookt, and which is enough to prevent any juſt exception againſt it; Then, *Conſider. on the Explic. pag.* 21. we have a ſtory of *Don Quixot*, and of *Dulcinea del Toboſo*, *pag.* 22. He makes the grave and learned Doctor to anſwer, That the three Divine Perſons are the Subſtance of God *in three Gambols or poſtures*. A little below, he thinks, it ſhould ſeem, that the Faithful muſt put their truſt *in there poſtures*.

Thus the Declamation goes on. *Posture* A *begets Posture* B, *Posture* A *and* B *breathe Posture* C. I appeal to these Gentlemen themselves, whether this is the way to vindicate Religion, and keep men from Atheism? Whether they seek to instruct or divert their Reader? Whether such petulant Sallies of Wit are like to do much for an Argument?

Dr. *South* going to deliver the Opinion of the Church concerning the Holy Trinity, does it *Animadv. Chap.* 8. *pag.* 240. with the humblest submission to the Judgment of the Church of *England.* Mr. *Milbourn* has done the same. There is in those sort of expressions a great deal of modesty and Justice. If an Author, even in a point of humane Learning, must not pretend to dictate; but gives an easie Introduction to his Reasons, by removing all that is Imposing and positive: How much more in the treating of things of so sacred and abstruse a nature? And is it not just that a private man who pretends to shew what the Church believes, should leave to the Church to judge whether he has not misrepresented her Doctrine? This submission of these Reverend Persons is thus taken up, *Consider. on the Explicat. pag.* 20. Truly I am heartily sorry that Dr. *South* has no fixt Religion of his own, no not concerning the Trinity "it self; but is ready to turn with the wind; is pre-"par'd to renounce a Doctrine and Explication which "he believes to be not only true, but fundamental; "if the Church commands him: and lower, "We "may infer however from these publick Professions of "the Writers, That could the *Socinians* get Mother "Church of their side, all her Champions would also "come over to us; for 'tis not, it seems, the Cause "that they defend; 'Tis not the *Trinity* and *Incar-*"*nation* which they value, but our Mother, our Mo-"ther the Church: and in the Preface to Mr. *Milbourn, pag.* 7. "On the same conditions Mother *Ship-*

"*ton*

" *ton* ſhould be as ſacred, and as infallible with them " as Mother Church, and they would believe the " Kingdom of *Oberon* and the Territories of *Fairy-*" *land.*

In a Book call'd the *Trinitarian Scheme*, which I can compare to nothing better than a Pamphlet, in the late King's Reign, intituled, *The Papiſt miſrepreſented and repreſented, pag.* 16. having miſrepreſented a Doctrine which is true in it ſelf, and that is, that the moſt wicked men are ſometimes converted to God at the laſt hour of their life, an Inſtance of which we have in the Thief on the Croſs; the Author is ſo far tranſported as to ſay, " The next thing that we may " expect from ſome men, is that they will write a " Panegyrick in the praiſe of the Devil.

Theſe Exceptions I make to their way of writing. There is another, I confeſs I muſt make to their perſons! I mean as to the Name which they are pleas'd to aſſume to themſelves. They are pleas'd to call themſelves *Unitarians*. To quarrel with a Name is ſomewhat extraordinary. But truly, that a handful of men who have not yet pretended to make a Body, and are only diſtinguiſht by a ſingularity of Opinions, which the whole Chriſtian World, even in their own Confeſſion exclaims againſt, is in its own nature ſtrangely extraordinary. If by *Unitarians* they mean all thoſe who live in the belief of One only true God, they do all Chriſtians an extreme injury. Since there is none who believes in, or adores more than one only God. I will not grudge to men the pleaſure to ſay that they are of *Cephas*, and *Apollo*, though contrary to his deſign, who would have us ſay, that we are of Chriſt, and only of Chriſt. If they have ſo great a veneration for Names as to love to be call'd *Calviniſts*, *Arminians*, *Socinians*, and what not; let them freely enjoy that imaginary happineſs. But to take the name of *Unitarians*, as if by it they pretend to

denominate a Sect, is a ſtrange ſort of Undertaking. But if by it they contradiſtinguiſh themſelves from us, by pretending to defend the Unity of God, it is an unwarrantable Invaſion of the Rights of all Chriſtians who make this the Foundation of their Faith.

They have run into another Exceſs, and call'd the Defenders of the Catholick Doctrine *Trinitarians*, having perſwaded themſelves, and endeavouring to perſwade the World, that we teach Tritheiſm, and by a more refin'd way of Idolatry, have brought in the Adoration of three Gods. Whereas they muſt acknowledge, that this is a Notion deteſted by all Chriſtians: that at the ſame time, that being taught from above, to uſe the expreſſion of an ancient Biſhop of the Greek Church, we aſſert three Perſons; we aſſert them in one only God: and that all that they have to ſay againſt this, is only a Conſequence ill drawn from a Doctrine which they have miſunderſtood.

The Queſtion is not between us, Whether God is one? This is granted on all ſides. The Queſtion is, Whether admitting three Perſons in that one God, does not deſtroy that Unity which we all contend for? Theſe Gentlemen ſay it does; We maintain that it does not.

Now the miſery in this caſe is, That the *Socinians* will not be contented with the common Topicks of arguing, which have hitherto been made uſe of amongſt Chriſtians. For when we pretend to prove what we advance, by ſuch places of Scripture as are plain and evident; then we meet with a witty Criticiſm, a pretty Paraphraſe, or a Tale by the by, as that in the Anſwerer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 36. The moſt Illuſtrious *Grotius*, or the moſt Learned *Eraſmus* come in at a dead lift. The one who in the brief Hiſtory of the *Unit. pag.* 11. is repreſented as *Socinian*

all

all over: The other, of whom it is ſaid in the ſame place, that he would have been of the *Arrian* Perſwaſion, if the Church had allow'd it.

When we anſwer their Objections, inſtead of that equitable Temper which is willing to be overcome; nothing being ſo glorious as to be conquer'd by the Truth; they tell us in the Thoughts upon Dr. *Sherlock*'s Vindication, *pag.* 12. "One may eaſily ſee how "convenient the *Machine* of probable Senſes is, which "our Divines bring into their Diſputes, what an ea-"ſy thing it is for them to free themſelves from preſ-"ſing difficulties! and make new Overtures with "theſe famous Keys of Tranſpoſitions of words, or "Clauſes, errours of Copies, *&c.*

When from the Authority of Scripture, we paſs to that of the Fathers, and they find themſelves preſſed with a Cloud of Witneſſes, they reply, Anſw. to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 44. "That indeed their Syſtem is "unknown to the Fathers, whoſe Writings are now "extant; But had not their Oppoſers ſuppreſt the "Works of *Aquila*, *Symmachus*, *Theodotion*, *Lucian*, "*Artemas*, *Theodorus*, *Paul* of *Antioch*, *Photinus* of *Syr-"mium*, *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, we had known their "Senſe better.

When we are even willing to do more than the nature of the thing in queſtion will bear, that is, explain that incomprehenſible Myſtery, and bring that as much as we can within the compaſs of our Reaſon, which indeed is above it; This they call, Thoughts upon Dr. *Sherlock*'s *Vindic. pag.* 8, 9. "To have our "Faith depend upon *Plato*'s Idea's, *Ariſtotle*'s Subtil-"ties, *Carteſius* his Self, and mutual Conſciouſneſs, "and metaphyſical Abſtractions more unintelligible to "poor Mortals than the Tongue of Angels: They exclaim againſt thoſe Expreſſions which Antiquity has conſecrated, and the common Conſent of the learned World made venerable; *Eſſence*, *Sub-*

stance, *Hypostasis*, *Generation*, *Spiration*, *Procession*: And yet these Gentlemen not only pretend to Reason; but would so monopolize it to themselves, as to make their Adversaries the most unreasonable people in the World. Reason in all their Writings is the Word. To it the most express Revelation must be made to stoop; and God must not be Judge of what he commands man to believe. But man assumes to himself to know, whether what God commands is agreeable to the Principles of his Reason? I know that they would seem to exclaim against this; and that in the Letter of Resolution concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity and Incarnation, *pag.* 1. they complain that they are charg'd with exalting Reason above Revelation. They apologize for it in the Observations of Dr. *Wallis*'s Letters, *pag.* 16. But how can this be reconcil'd with this Assertion, *Considerat. on the Explicat. of the Doctr. of the Trin. pag.* 5. "If Heaven "and Earth were miraculously destroy'd to confirm an Interpretation which disagrees with the natural and Grammatical sense of the words, it will for all that remain a false Interpretation: Which in plain English amounts to this; that though Heaven contradicts an Interpretation by the most forcible sort of Argument, which is a real Miracle, and such as the Destruction of the whole World; yet if it does not agree with that natural or Grammatical sense which our Reason makes of these words; The Miracle will be true, but the Interpretation false.

I am willing to give to Reason all the weight and admiration that it deserves, it being the distinguishing Character of man, and that by which he ought to be guided in his spiritual and temporal Concerns. But there is a rational way of using our Reason, which when strain'd beyond its bounds, is no more Reason but extravagance and obstinacy. When the greatest Authority in the World imposes on us the belief of

that

that which our Reason cannot penetrate or understand: It is not the work of Reason to reject it, because the Notion is unintelligible, and in our imperfect way of Reasoning offers seeming Contradictions. But the truest and noblest Exercise of our Reason is to submit to that Authority; and when we are satisfy'd that God speaks; man is never so rational; as when he yields without any inquiry into what he is pleas'd to reveal. I say, *seeming* Contradictions; for admitting the Divine Revelation, no Contradiction can be real. We may imagine that indeed it is so, because we are men who know very little, and in the state of sin and weakness that we are in, meet with a thousand obstacles to our perceptions. But supposing that God has deliver'd it, there can be no such thing as a Contradiction, because howsoever I apprehend it, it still comes from him who cannot contradict himself.

The Question once more is not of the Unity of the Divine Nature. The Orthodox are as stiff as they in the point. The Question is, Whether the Trinity of Persons destroys or no the Unity of that Divine Nature? The Orthodox must carry it, if they can prove that the same God who has reveal'd the one, has also reveal'd the other. For if he has done this, our duty is to adore in an humble silence what we cannot understand, and those very Contradictions which we fansie in the thing reveal'd, ought only to be to us sensible proofs of our ignorance, and deep arguments of humiliation. The *Socinians* then are in a great mistake, and instead of writing Books after Books to shew the pretended inconsistencies and contradictions in the Revelation; they ought to prove plainly that it is not reveal'd at all. For if it clearly appears that it is so, the pretended Contradictions must lye at their door, but the Revelation will still be safe and certain.

It

It is ſtrange that ingenious men, who meet with ſo many things unintelligible in Nature, will have nothing to be ſo in Religion! They will ſubmit to Philoſophical proofs and Mathematical demonſtrations, which are at moſt but natural Evidences, and will reject the greateſt and moſt certain Evidence, which is Faith. Nothing can take them from reaſoning, and nothing will bring them to believe. *Whether the thing is*, is the Queſtion? *How it is*, does not at all belong to us. How the Father communicates his Eſſence to the Son; How the Holy Ghoſt proceeds from both; How three Perſons ſubſiſt in the ſame Divine Nature, can be no part of our inquiry. If we can but be ſatisfy'd that God has ſo reveal'd himſelf to us, that he is God, that in that Deity which is one, there are three equally adorable Perſons; we have nothing to do with the *How*? Let us adore and believe the thing, and reſerve the manner to a better and a happier life, where *we ſhall know even as we are alſo known*, 1 Cor. 13. 12.

Thoſe Reverend Perſons, who out of condeſcenſion to querulous men, have undertaken to give Explications of the Trinity in Unity, never pretended to go further. They never thought that this could be Geometrically prov'd. They built upon the Revelation, and endeavour'd to find every one that way which ſeem'd to them the apteſt to reconcile what theſe Gentlemen call Contradictions: But left the thing it ſelf as incomprehenſible, and relying on his Authority who reveal'd it. The *Socinians* are not candid in the matter. They endeavour to diſprove the *Athanaſian* Creed. They pretend to anſwer the late Archbiſhop, the Biſhops of *Worceſter* and *Sarum*; They ridicule Dr. *Wallis*. They inſult the Dean of *Paul's*. They are rude to Dr. *South*, but ſtill are clamorous about the *How can it be?* and are not ſerious in proving that it is not.

Theſe

Theſe Gentlemen have pretended, that by denying the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt*, and of the *Holy Ghoſt*, they make the Scripture plain, intelligible and obvious to the meaneſt capacities. They think after this to have remov'd all thoſe difficulties, which the Clergy call Myſteries, but are not ſo in themſelves. In the impartial account of the word Myſtery; *pag.* 3. "By the means of Myſtery, Divines have made Religion a very difficult thing, that is, an Art which "Chriſtians are not able to underſtand: and thereby "they raiſe themſelves above the common Chriſtians, "and are made neceſſary to the People, improving "that Art to their own benefit. Paſſing by the incivility of the reflexion, I dare affirm, that denying the Divinity of Chriſt and of the Holy Spirit, nothing is eaſie, nothing is plain in Religion: That the Scripture is the darkeſt Book that ever was written: and that no Chriſtian can find the ſatisfaction of his mind, and the peace of his conſcience.

It may be ſaid with a great deal of truth, that the ſtream of the Scriptures runs that way: that the belief of the Holy Trinity and the union of the two natures in Chriſt is the Key to all difficulties: and that diſtinction ſo much laught at by theſe Gentlemen, of one thing ſaid of him as *God*, and of another as *Man*, which has been us'd by all the Fathers, is the only method to come to the Knowledge of the truth. This will be prov'd by the reading of both Teſtaments. For if thoſe things are ſpoken of Chriſt which can relate to none but Man, and at the ſame time thoſe things are ſpoken of him, which belong to none but to God; ſhall we preſume to ſeparate what God has united? ſhall we run to the extreams of the Old Hereticks, who would not admit of a real humane nature in Chriſt, and offer'd an incredible violence to all thoſe texts which repreſent him as a Man; Or as the *Socinians*, who denying his Divinity, put to the torture all thoſe places, which ſpeak of him as God. To

To take off at once the authority of the Old Testament and make ineffectual those glorious predictions of Christ, which tell us what he was before he was in the World; They confidently assert in the brief History, *pag.* 22. "That the more learned and Judi-"cious *Trinitarians* confess, that the *Trinity*, and the "*Divinity* of the Lord Christ, and of the Holy Spirit, "are not indeed taught in the Scriptures of the Old "Testament; but are a revelation made in the new. "Nay 'tis the more general opinion of the Divines "of all sects and perswasions. They cite for this some Authors, and amongst them *Tertulian. adversus Prax.* Which I would beg of them to read more exactly. It is the fault of these Gentlemen, to be vastly large in their citations, and to pretend to have Authors of their side who are really against them. The mistakes I hope are not willful, but they are somewhat frequent. Neither the ancient or modern Doctors ever said that the Old Testament had nothing in it, by which Men might be induc'd to the notice of a *Trinity* of persons in God, and of the *Divinity* of Christ and of the Holy Spirit. They have said indeed that the Jews had no explicite or clear Knowledge, nor no explicite or direct belief of those mysteries: Which is true; The revelation of the *Trinity* in *Unity* being the previledge of the Gospel, and a considerable part of that Grace and truth which came by *Christ Jesus.* Joh. 1. 18. *No Man has seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he has declar'd him.*

How could the Old Testament be the form of, and the introduction to the new, if those truths were not adumbrated in the one, which are clearly reveal'd, and explain'd in the other? How comes it to be a maxim receiv'd amongst the Old Jewish Doctors, that whatsoever is recorded in the Law, in the Prophets, and in the sacred Books, *Indicant sapientiam*; *point at Christ,*

Christ, the ineffable Wisdom or Word? How does St. *Paul* lay this as an Aphorism, Rom. 10. 4. *Christ is the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes*? How comes he before *Agrippa* and *Festus*, solemnly to declare that he says nothing, but what *Moses* and the Prophets have assur'd should be? How come the Apostles and Evangelists to take most of their arguments from the Writings of the Prophets. St. *Austin* treats this at large against *Faustus*, *lib.* 12. c. 46. *Eusebius*, *Præp. Evang. l. c.* 3. St. *Cyprian Præfat. ad Quirin.* tells him that the sacred Writings of the Old Testament are of great use, *ad prima fidei lineamenta formanda*: *To form the first lineaments of our Faith.* *Origen* against *Celsus*, *lib.* 2. calls this, ἰσχυροτάτην ἀπόδειξιν, *a most strong demonstration*, and *Lactantius*, *Instit. lib.* 5. *c.* 3. *Disce igitur, si quid tibi cordis est, non solum idcirco à nobis Christum creditum Deum, quia mirabilia fecit, sed quia vidimus in eo facta esse omnia quæ nobis annunciata sunt vaticinio Prophetarum. Be sensible then, if thou hast any honesty or conscience left, that Christ is believ'd by us to be God, not olny because he has done miraculous things, but because we have seen all the things fulfill'd in him which have been announc'd to us by the Prophets. Non igitur suo Testimonio, cui enim de se dicenti potest credi? sed Prophetarum Testimonio, qui omnia quæ fecit & passus est multo ante cecinerunt, fidem Divinitatis accepit. It is not then by the Testimony which he has given of himself; for who can be believ'd who Witnesses for himself? but by the Testimony of the Prophets, who have Propheſi'd long before, all that he has done and suffer'd; He has receiv'd that Men should believe his Divinity.*

The first proof which offers it self out of the Old Testament is that expression of the Almighty, *Gen.* 1. 26. *Let us make Man in* our *image*, *after* our *likeness*. It is undenyable that in the text as well as in the translation God is pleas'd to speak in the plural number.

number. And as we cannot admitt a multiplicity of Gods in a nature which is so entirely one, so we cannot but see a kind of consultation in the Divine Persons. It is visible that God does not speak to himself, or to any created being who cannot concurr in any manner to the creation of Man, It being an incommunicable property of the Divine nature. And it is an impiety to think that God should speak in the air, and to no purpose. What is meant then by the *Us*, but that Son by whom he made all things, and *without whom nothing was made, that was made*, Joh. 1. 3. and that Holy Spirit *which moved upon the face of the Waters*, Gen. 1. 2. This the Fathers urg'd against the *Arrians*.

These Gentlemen answer; Brief History, pag. 8. *1st*. That this is done according to the customs of Princes and great persons in all languages, that is, in an oratory and figurative way. *2ly* pag. 15. that God speaks to the Angels who were present not as adjutants, but spectators of his work. The presence of Angels is prov'd out of *Job* 38. 7. This second reason is singular, and the verse to prove the presence of Angels strangely dragg'd in. But it ruins it self. For if the Angels are not adjutants to the work, How comes God to say, *Let us make* Man. This does not at all reach the difficulty. The first is as bad, that this is done according to the Custom of Princes. It is strange that God should have laid the *Custom* aside in the formation of all the rest of the Creatures, and us'd it only in that of Man. For to say that it is the same as *v.* 3. *let there be light*, v. 6. *let there be a firmament*, &c. it is only a gloss and a comment against which the sence of the words stands unmoveable. It is stranger yet, that out of Oratory and Custom, which in its greatest Pomp is much below the Majesty of any divine expression; God should speak in a way which to these Gentlemen seems contrary to the unity of

of his nature. I farely ask, whether it was *cuſtom* which caus'd God to alter the manner of his expreſſion in all the Verſes before; or elſe a deſign to ſpeak ſomewhat in this, myſterious to us. The firſt is groundleſs, and unconceivable: Therefore the laſt muſt be admitted. And this is ſo much the more rational, becauſe the *Socinians* are Men too learned not to know that the Primitive Writers, or to ſpeak the words of a truly great Man of this Nation, *all the firſt Writers of the Church of God have expreſly attributed the Creation of Man to the Son, and have brought in the Father, ſpeaking thus to him, Let us make Man.* Not to multiply citations, read *Orig. cont. Celſ. l.* 2.

In *Gen.* 3. 22. is another place of the ſame nature, and to the ſame deſign. *The Man is become as one of us, to know good and evil.* I think, that cuſtom of Princes has nothing to do here. Thoſe little Pedantical evaſions are too mean for the weight of the expreſſion. If there is but one Perſon in the Divine Nature, how comes the *Us* ſo emphatically? Why, ſay thoſe Gentlemen in the page cited, *Onkelos*, and *Oleaſter*, render the words more truly, *The Man is become one, knowing of himſelf good and evil.* *Grotius* not truſting to this, would have God ſpeak here to Angels. Thus a groundleſs ſuppoſition is made a ſolid anſwer to a tranſlation univerſally receiv'd before any of theſe Diſputes. I humbly conceive, that the Irony us'd in that place has no force, if the knowledge here ſpoken of, is not that Primitive, Eſſential Knowledge which belongs only to God; which Man's ambitious deſigns aim'd at, and of which neither he nor Angels are capable of, *v.* 5. *You ſhall be as Gods, knowing good and evil*, which is to ſay juſt nothing, if this conſiſts in the ſad experience of his misfortune, and not in the raſhneſs of his undertaking.

The book of *Job* is certainly a part of the Old Teſtament, and St. *Auſtin* in an Epiſtle to St. *Jerom* calls

Job

Job deservedly a Prophet. In the 19.25,26,27. he expresses himself thus. *I know that my redeemer lives, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth, and though after my Skin Worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God.* The old Latin Interpreter reads, *Deum meum, my God; Whom I shall see for my self, and my eyes shall behold, and not another.* I pass over that most solemn and elegant Preface more lasting than the rock on which he wishes the assertion to be written. 1*st*. The Holy man draws an argument of comfort in the deepest of his afflictions from the thoughts of another and a better life. 2*ly*. He looks upon him who is able to save to the uttermost not only them that come after, but all them also who are gone before him. 3*ly*. He is satisfi'd that he *lives* who will redeem him from the pains that he lyes under; who knows his innocence because he is the searcher of the hearts. 4*ly*. He asserts a final judgment wherein justice will be done to all men, who shall rise from their graves and be clothed with flesh to receive it. 5*ly*. He avers that he who lives now, though invisible, will become visible, and be their Judge in that great day. 6*ly*. He is now only the object of his knowledge and faith; but then he shall be the object of his sense. *He shall see him.* 7*ly*. He who is now invisible, but shall be visible then, he calls *His God*, the ground of his hope, and indeed of all his confidence. This is so positive that it is capable of no allegory, but only of a litteral sence. That this is spoken of Christ is agreed by the old *Rabbins*. That it is understood of Jesus is the opinion of most Christian Interpreters. That that God who is represented here as *living* according to the noble and usual expression of Scripture, which cannot be apply'd to *Moses*, *Solomon*, or any of them who are call'd Gods, will stand as a judge, and be seen by men in their Flesh, and be behel'd with their eyes, is not the Father, is

consented

consented to on all hands. It must then be the Son, who in the union of the two natures is the Redeemer: Who as God is known to live, and to inhabit Eternity: Who in the fullness of Times has appear'd in the flesh, and obtained to be at the end of the World the judge of the quick and dead.

It may be objected to this that *Grotius*, for these Gentlemen look upon an objection not to be answerable, if it has but the name of *Grotius*, is positive, that the Jews never understood this text of the resurrection of the dead. How this learned man comes to be mistaken is strange to me: But that he is so, may invincibly be made to appear from the body of the Jewish Writers.

What is taken out of the Book of Psalms to prove the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, has so much the more force, because most of it is appli'd to the same purpose by the writers of the New Testament. This gives these proofs a double authority, and fully determines their sence. Nor can any other be put upon them then that in which they are taken by them whom we all acknowledge to be inspir'd.

This is so natural and carries so much self-evidence along with it, that I cannot hear without a deep astonishment *Hugo Grotius* saying, that those Prophecies, *Non in vim argumenti propriè adhiberi, sed ad illustrandam, atque confirmandam rem jam creditam. That they are not properly arguments to make us believe, but a sort of illustrations, and confirmations of a truth already believ'd.* I thought those excesses buri'd long since with *Theodore* of *Mopsweſt*, Anathematis'd on that very account by the Fathers of the fifth General Council, and *Faustus* the Manichee so often confounded by St. *Austin*. I was glad to hear, Observat. on Dr. *Wallis*'s four Letters, *pag.* 16. "That those Gentlemen do not "profess to follow *Socinus*, but the Scripture: that if "*Socinus* has at any time spoken erroneously, or unad-

" visedly, or Hyperbolically, tis not *Socinus* who is " their Master, but *Christ*; yet after all they espouse the same enormity in the brief Hist. *pag.* 16, 17. and lay this as a rule.—" Nothing is more usual with the " Writers of the New Testament, than to apply to " the Lord Christ in a mystical, or allegorical sence, " what has been said by the Writers of the Old Testa- " ment, of God, or any other, in the litteral and primary " sence of the words. This they do as often as there is " any likeness between the Persons, or things, or " events——He that shall read the Thalmud, or o- " ther Rabbinical Writings, will see that the Apostles " took this way of Interpreting from the Writers of " the Jewish Nation. For as often as the Jewish *Rabbins* " met with any event, or thing, or Person like to what " is recorded in some place of the Old Testament, they " said, that place was fullfill'd, or was again fullfill'd; " and accommodated immediately the words of such " Scripture to that Person, event, or thing.

If this be receiv'd it is a folly to pretend to reason, or to dispute. *First*, Though there are some Prophecies of Christ which may admit of a litteral sence, yet several are capable of none, and in those that do, the mystical is alwayes principally intended.

Secondly, The Apostolical Writers are by all sides suppos'd to be inspir'd; and could not by chance apply to Christ those places of the Old Testament which discover him to us. When the spirit of God applies positively this or that text to Christ; It shews that this or that text, whatsoever litteral sence might appear in it, was the principal sence and only design of the Prophecy.

Thirdly, The Apostles and Evangelists never pretended to prove Jesus to be *Messias*, the Son of God, by way of allusion and allegory, or by an occasional fulfilling of Prophecies: But by a real, palpable, entire, and noble way of accomplishing in him what had been Propheſi'd of Old. *Fourthly*,

Fourthly, It had been a strange undertaking in the Apostles, to pretend to shew Prophecies fulfill'd in Christ; if these Prophecies had not been known and publick to the World, and principally directed to be fulfill'd in him. If all is occasional, what makes St. *Paul*, to tell the *Ephesians*? ch. 2. v 20. *That they are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone*; and *Origen* against *Cels. lib.* 1. lay this as a principle, that it is, Τὸ μέγιστον τῶν περὶ τῆς συστάσεως τῶν Ἰησοῦ κεφαλαίων, *The greatest of all the arguments by which the faith of Christ can be prov'd.*

If people durst allow themselves not to be serious in so grave a dispute; How would the Notion be expos'd of Men suppos'd and granted to be divinely inspir'd, Who should write after the Thalmud and the Rabbinical Writers?

The *first* proof then of another Person in the *Trinity*, and understood of *Christ* by the Apostles, is Psal. 2. 7. *The Lord has said to me, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And as a consequence of this, *Ask of me and I shall give thee the Heathen for thine inheritance, and the utmost parts of the earth, for thy possession.* The Author of the brief Hist. *pag.* 15. understands this only of *Christ* being begotten to a new life, the day of his resurrection, and by it acquiring the title of the Son of God. He pretends to prove it by Act. 13. 33. *God has fullfill'd the same, in that he has rais'd up Jesus again; as it is also written in the second Psalm, Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee.* And Indeed that sence would appear very plain if there were not a double objection against it. 1*st*. If there were no place in the Scripture that did assert a Generation of Christ before his resurrection. 2*ly*. If the Apostle himself did not cite this very place in another sence. For the first, These Gentlemen themselves agree that Christ was the Son of God and begot-

ten of him from the Moment of his Incarnation: That he was declar'd to be ſo, Matt. 3.17. *This is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleas'd:* and that the name is given him every where in Scripture before his ſufferings. This mightily blunts the anſwer: For if *this day I have begotten thee* be no more in the ſence of the Apoſtle than *this day I have made thee my Son, by raiſing thee to a new life*, *Chriſt* receives nothing new by it, ſince he was, and was declar'd even in their opinion to be ſo before. But it will be quite overthrown, if we conſider that the ſame Prophet, Pſ. 110. appli'd by the Jews to the *Meſſias*, and by the ſacred Writers to *Chriſt*, and ſo poſitively urg'd by Chriſt himſelf, that Matt. 22. 46. *No man was able to anſwer him a word, nor durſt any man from that time forth ask him any more queſtions*; I ſay, that the Prophet ſpeaks thus. v. 3. *in the beauties of holineſs from the womb of the Morning thou haſt the dew of thy youth.* Which is not only before the reſurrection, but even before the World. But if it is read according to the old Latin Tranſlation, which the learned World and theſe very Gentlemen reverence ſo much, *Ante Luciferum genui te*: *I have begotten thee before the Morning ſtar was*; which place was ſo read by *Juſtin Martyr* againſt *Trypho*, and by *Tertullian lib.* 5. contr. *Marcion*, The ſence of the Apoſtle cannot be, that he was the Son of God, and begotten by him by riſing to a new life.

For the *ſecond*, The Apoſtle cites the ſame Scripture in another ſence, and this twice. 1*ſt*. *Heb.* 1. 5. 2*ly*. *Heb.* 5. 5. The one to prove that he was much better than the Angels, and had a far more glorious name: The other to evince that he gloriſi'd not himſelf to be made a High Prieſt: Treating of the one without any relation to his reſurrection: and as for the other it is agreed from all hands, to have preceeded it, *Chriſt* being made our High Prieſt, not by riſing from the dead; but by offering on the Croſs the Sacrifice of himſelf.

The

The ſence then of the Apoſtle can be no other than this, That *Chriſt* in his reſurrection did eminently appear to be the Son of God. That his reſurrection is a ſplendid declaration of the Divinity of his Nature, And that as his ſufferings ſpoke him to be really Man, loaden with our infirmities, and dying for our Sins; ſo his reſurrection from the dead declar'd him to be God. This *Tertullian* expreſſes elegantly in theſe words, adverſ. Jud. c. 12. *Aſpice univerſas nationes de voragine erroris humani exinde emergentes ad Dominum Deum Creatorem, & ad Deum Chriſtum ejus. Et ſi audes, nega Prophetatum, ſtatim tibi promiſſio patris occurrit in Pſalmis, dicens, Filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te. Look upon all the Nations of the earth, ariſing out of the Gulph of Men's errors to the Lord God the Creator, and to the God his Chriſt. And if thou dar'ſt, deny the Prophecy, Immediately the promiſe preſents it ſelf to thee in the Pſalms, ſaying thou art my Son, this day I have begotten thee.*

The 6, *and* 7. *v.* Of the 45 Pſalm run thus. *Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever: The Scepter of thy kingdom is a right Scepter*, or a Scepter of Juſtice. *Thou loveſt righteouſneſs and hateſt iniquity. Therefore God, Thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy* Fellows. That this is ſpoken of the *Meſſias* is the unanimous aſſertion of the ancient Jews. The Chaldee Paraphraſe interprets the ſecond verſe, *Thy beauty, O Meſſias the King, exceeds that of the Sons of Men.* Their conſent is ſo general in this, that they never ſo much as dream'd of *Solomon* in this. *Aquila* reads it in the Vocative Caſe, ὁ θεός σου, θεὲ, εἰς αἰῶνα, &c. The Apoſtle has not accommodated, or appli'd it to Chriſt, as theſe Gentlemen are pleas'd to ſpeak: But has cited, and underſtood it as a direct Prophecy of the *Holy Jeſus.* Heb. 1. 7, 8. His deſign is to ſhew that *Chriſt* is above all that is created; and becauſe in created beings we know nothing greater than the

Angels, He says, *v.* 4. That he is so much better than the Angels, *that he has by inheritance obtain'd a more excellent name than they.* I hope that by the name of Angels it will not be deny'd that their being and nature is express't according to the Dialect of Scripture. Or else, What signifies the distinction of *inheriting* a name, or a name *by inheritance*, from a name given? What the Angels are is by the favour and gift of the Creator: what *Christ* is, is by nature and *inheritance*. He shews then of the Angels, *v.* 7. what is their name, what they are: *He makes his Angels spirits, and his Ministers a flame of fire.* v. 8. He brings in God speaking to Christ as to his Son, discovering his nature, his name by inheritance. *But to the Son he says, Thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever.*

To this these Gentlemen Answer in the brief Hist. *pag.* 16. "That the words are litterally spoken of "*Solomon*, and mystically of *Christ*. That this is the "opinion of *Grotius*. But that whether they are spo-"ken litterally of *Solomon*, and mystically of *Christ*, "neither *Christ*, nor *Solomon* are here call'd *God*. The "place being ill translated: The Hebrew and the "Greek importing no more than this, God is thy "Throne, that is thy resting place, or establishment for "ever and ever.

I began to admire how these Gentlemen deny that *Solomon* is here call'd *God*, who, when we prove that *Christ* is call'd God in many places of Scripture, have made this answer almost thredbare, that he is call'd God as *Solomon* is here, and *Moses*, Exod. 7. 1.

But they unsay this again and are somewhat larger in the answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 8. They cite *Grotius* who makes this Psalm to be an Epithalamium sung by the maids to *Solomon* and *Sulamitis* the Daughter of the King of *Egypt*. They say, "That we catch "at the word *God*, as if the Psalmist, and the Author "of the Epistle to the Hebrews spoke of such a Person,

"as

" as is truly and really God. That we ſhould note that " Chriſt tells us, *Joh.* 10. 35. That thoſe alſo are call'd " Gods in Scripture to whom the word of God comes. " That *Solomon* in this Pſalm is ſaluted by the Name " of *God* according to the known language of thoſe " times and Countries to Magiſtrates and Princes.

But after all, the place of the Hebrews is ſo preſſing that they paſs from accomodation and application, and are willing to allow that he interprets the words of *Chriſt*, becauſe " The Pſalm being compos'd by a Pro- " phetical Poet, at the ſame time that he courted and " prais'd *Solomon*, He might Prophecy of *Chriſt*: That " this account is approv'd by the moſt learned Criticks.

One would have expected from men of learning ſomewhat more ſolid. When we ſay that *Chriſt* is call'd *God*, we are ſo far from catching at the word *God*, that we maintain it to be after a manner ſo peculiar to the moſt high God, that it is applicable to no Man; and that what the Prophet ſay's, and the Apoſtle after him, is viſible to the meaneſt capacity, can be ſaid neither of *Moſes*, or *Solomon*, or any Prince or Magiſtrate. The buſineſs of the Epithalamiums and the cuſtom of the Eaſtern People are pretty little imaginations. That it is not render'd according to the Hebrew, or the Greek, is notoriouſly ſuppos'd. The Interpretation of *Grotius* is both ſenceleſs, and falſe. It is ſenceleſs; For what addition is it to the *Meſſias*, that God is his reſting place? Is he not ſo to all good men? Are not our Souls made perfect by his grace committed into his hands, as unto a faithful Creator, to become Eternally happy? It is falſe, and that viſibly too, by the reading of the next verſe. *Therefore, O God, Thy God has anointed thee with the oil of gladneſs above thy fellows.* I read, *O God.* For thus *Euſebius demonſ. Evang. lib.* 4. *Orig. con. Celſ. lib.* 1. St. *Jerom Epiſ.* 140. have prov'd, that it ought to be read, both from the nature of the thing, and the letter of the

sacred Text. St. *Austin* in his Exposition on this very Psalm, which in the old Interpreter is the 44*th*, is positive, that this is manifest from the Greek. This has caus'd several learned men to think, that what is written in the Septuagint, διὰ τοῦτο ἔχρισεν ὁ θεὸς, ὁ θεός σου was formerly written, ὁ θεὸς, ὁ θεός σου. Though *Eusebius* in the place already cited makes it evident from many unquestionable Texts of Scripture; that the ὁ θεὸς, answers fully the ὁ θεὸ, which we have said is the sence of the place, and the reading of *Aquila*.

As for Criticks, I highly honour them who have really endeavour'd to find out the true sence of the difficult places of Scripture. I own *Grotius* in particular to have been a Man of great learning; But to criticise in Texts which are plain and easie, and to torture the words of the Holy Writers, to make them bear with notions altogether new and unknown to antiquity, I think to be insufferable.

I am perswaded that this Psalm was never intended for *Solomon* by the argument of the ancient Jews; that the 3, 4, and 5. verses which represent a fighting and a conquering Prince, can never be made to agree to one whose name expresses, and whose life was spent in a profound peace.

The 110 Psalm is understood of the *Messias* by the Thargum and most of the old Rabbins. That it was so by the Jews in *Christ's* time appears by his publick appealing to the authority of this Psalm. That it is an eminent Prophecy of *Christ* is evident by his own assertion, *Matt.* 22. 43, 44. St. *Peter* proves from thence that he is both *Lord and Christ*, Acts. 2. 34, 35, 36. The Author of the Epistle to the *Heb.* draws from thence most of his Arguments, *Heb.* 1. 13. and 5. 6, 20. and 7. 1. and sol. ver. And indeed offer no violence to the Psalm, but take what it plainly presents, It looks more like a revelation of the new, then a Prophecy of the old dispensation.

The first verse expresses clearly the Divinity of *J. C.*

The

The Lord said unto my Lord, *Sit thou at my right hand.* One Divine Person is reveal'd to *David* speaking to another, *The Lord*, *saying to My Lord.* The argument of *Christ* is irrefragable. If the *Christ* is no more than the Son of *David*; If he has no other nature than that which he draws from him, How comes God to call him *Lord* in that revelation which he made of him? The second verse shews his regal dignity, that power which he has over all. *The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Sion, rule thou in the midst of thy enemies.* The third, his pre-existence before all created beings, and consequently a being in God and from God, which can be no other way than by a communication of the Divine Essence. *From the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth.* Or as the old Latin Interpreter, St. *Chrysostom* on this Psalm, St. *Jerom* on the 22. of Matt. *Ante Luciferum genui te. Before the morning Star was, I have begotten thee.* The fourth, his Eternal Priesthood; *Thou art a Priest for ever after the order of Melchisedeck*: Wherein is impli'd that intercession, mediation, and sacrifice of himself, which had he been no more than a meer Man, must have been ineffectual.

These Gentlemen take no notice of the 2, and 4. verse, and in my opinion answer strangely the 1*st*, and the 3*d*. What they say to the 1*st*, in the brief Hist. *pag.* 18. consists in this; 1*st*, "That the words "of our Saviour are, *David in Spirit calls him Lord*, "saying, *the Lord said unto*, &c. That is, *David* in "the spirit of Prophecy foreseeing Christ, calls him *his* "*Lord*; not because *Christ* is God, for then himself "could have made his enemies his foot-stool. But "because not only the spirit of *David*, and of all "Saints, but even Angels were to be made subject to "him as the reward of his most holy life and obsequi-"ous and acceptable death. 2*ly*. That when the "Psalmist says, *The Lord said unto my Lord*, it is to

"be

" be underſtood thus, The Lord has in his decree ſaid, " or he has decreed it ſhall be ſo.

I appeal to themſelves whether this is to anſwer, or only elude an objection? For it is notorious that the ſpirit in which *David* ſpeaks is the ſpirit of Prophecy. *David* being a Prophet ſpeaks what God has reveal'd to him. It is falſe that he calls Chriſt *his Lord*, or that he ſpeaks to *Chriſt*. He calls *Chriſt Lord*, ſayes our Saviour, but not *his Lord*. This is a real miſtake, and the reaſon given for it of the ſpirit of *David*, of Saints, of Angels made ſubject to him is another. He muſt ſpeak of Chriſt as God, or elſe the Prophecy ſays nothing. The *Lord* in one place is of the ſame importance and ſignification as the *Lord* in the other. Neither the words, nor the ſence, nor our Saviour give to *David* any other part in the Prophecy, but the relating that *the Lord*, the Father, has ſaid to *the Lord*, the Son, the *Chriſt*, *Sit thou on my right hand.* An argument which invincibly proves the Son Coeternal and coequal to the Father. Nor does the ſaying *till I make thy Enemies thy foot-ſtool*, take any thing off its force, ſince the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 15. 25. Says of the Son himſelf, that *He muſt reign till he has put all Enemies under his feet.*

The ſecond part of the anſwer, that *the Lord ſaid to my Lord*, is to be underſtood, The Lord has ſaid in his decree, or has decreed it ſhall be ſo, is a wild, ſtrain'd, unnatural, and new explication. If men will give themſelves the liberty thus to comment on the moſt expreſs and clear Texts of Scripture, nothing can be ſacred, or certain in Religion. Our Saviour asks the Phariſees, *Matt.* 2. 24. What they think of *Chriſt*, whoſe Son is he? They anſwer him plainly, The Son of *David*. *Chriſt* replies again, *How then does David call him Lord?* If he is no more then the Son of *David*, How does *David* declare him to be *Lord*; and this by the greateſt authority in the World, even

the

the Lord calling him so. If he is the Son of *David* without running to a decree, which indeed should rather be admitted here, then he is without a decree the *Lord*, being as much the one by nature as the other. These Gentlemen are desir'd to produce any one of the Fathers or ancient Writers who has understood this place of any such imaginary decree.

The third verse is so pressing that all they have to say to it, is that both the place is obscure and the many versions made of it. They like that of *Castalio* best, which cuts the Gordian knot and substitutes other words and sence to that of the Prophet. I think that the Greek is very clear, the old Latin very clear, *Justin* Martyr, *Tertullian*, St. *Chrysostom*, St. *Jerom*, St. *Austin*, and most of the Fathers very clear, who have read as we have said before, and are to prefer'd to a version as new and as inconsiderable as its Author.

In the ninth Chapter of Isaias *v.* 6, 7. We have these words, *Unto us a Child is born, unto us a Son is given: and the Government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be call'd Wonderful, Counsellor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of peace.* That they are a Prophecy of the *Messias*, The Chaldee Paraphrase and several learned Jews have positively asserted. From them *Eusebius*, *Basil* the great, *Theodoret*, St. *Cyrill*, *Procopius*, St. *Jerom*, and the generality of the Fathers have prov'd the Divinity of *Christ*. And indeed those Epithets which make up the character of this Son that is given can become no creature. They are all the names which belong to God, and by them as he reveal'd himself to men. Which of the Sons of men can be *wonderfull*, or secret, mysterious? as the Angel expresses the name of God to *Manoah*, *Jud.* 13. 18. Which can be the *Councellor*, the Director, the Guide, the light from whence all Wisdom is deriv'd? Which can be the *mighty God*, the God of strength and power? Which can be the *Everlasting*

Father,

Father, or, as St. *Jerom* reads, *the Father of the age to come:* that is, The Author and giver of immortality? Which can be the *peaceable Prince*, or the Prince of peace, in whose hands is our present or Eternal peace? In a word, to which of us mortals can any of those Emphatical expressions be attributed without absurdity, or Blasphemy?

To this those Gentlemen answer, Brief Hist. *pag.* 20*th.* 1*st.* That this can be no Prophecy since *Isaias* speaks of a Prince actually born, and the Prophet liv'd 700 Years before Christ. 2*ly.* That this Text is never appli'd to *Christ* by the Writers of the New Testament. 3*ly.* That the Text is to be understood of *Hezekiah.* 4*ly.* That it is extravagantly render'd into English. In the answer to Mr. *Milbourn* they say almost the same things; only add this flourish; "That they affect no monstrosities, but are govern'd "by the obvious reason and possibilities of things.

For the 1*st*, That it can be no Prophecy since it speaks of a Prince actually born, is to suppose that which ought to be prov'd, and can never be certainly made out. But granting that it can; have these Gentlemen forgot what they said in their answer to an authority of the 45. *Ps.* 6, 7. That the Prophetical Poet at the same time that he prais'd and courted *Solomon*, who was certainly then actually born, might also Prophesy of *Christ.* A Prince then may be actually born, and what is said of him may also be a Prophecy. St. *Austin* against *Faustus lib.* 12. *cap.* 46. pretends and really in a very solid way of reasoning, that not only the Prophets did announce *Christ*: But the very Nation of the Jews, that very People, their very government and administration were all a Prophecy. *Per Propheticam gentem*, *per Propheticum populum*, *per Propheticum regnum*, and yet the one actually in being, the other actually born before *Christ.*

For the 2*d*, That this Text is never appli'd to Christ

Christ in the New Testament; should this be granted, the Text would still preserve its Authority. Our Adversaries are Presons of too much learning to pretend that there is no Prophecy of *Christ* in the Old, but what is appli'd to him in the New Testament. But we may say, that there is not a Text oftner and more fully to be met with, than this in the New Testament. For tho' it is not formally cited as some others are; yet every part of it is found in the Writings of the Apostles. The Prophet says, that he is *wonderful*, secret, Mysterious. St. *Paul* says, *Eph.* 1. 26, 27. That he is *the Mystery*, *which has been hid from Ages and Generations, but now is made manifest, to his Saints.* The Prophet calls him the *Councellor.* The Apostle says *Colos.* 2. 3. *That in him are hid all the treasures of Wisdom and knowledge.* "We believe says "*Origen*, lib. 3. adv. *Celsum.* ἀρχῶν *from the very* "*beginning of Christianity*, of this our *Jesus*, that *he is* "*God, and the Son of God*, the very Word itself, the "very Wisdom itself, the very Truth itself. The Prophet says, that he is *the mighty God*, or the God of strength; St. *Joh. Rev.* 5. 12. assures, that *power, strength, glory, and honour are his.* The Prophet calls him the *Everlasting Father*, or, as St. *Jerom*, The Father of the Age to come. The Author of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, ch. 5. 9. calls him *the Author of Eternal salvation.* The Prophet says, that he is *the Prince of Peace.* The Apostle stiles him, *Eph.* 2. 14. *Our Peace who has made both one, and has broken down the middle wall of partition between us.*

For the 3*d*, That this Text is to be understood of *Hezekias*; These Gentlemen should have taken notice that St. *Jerom* has invincibly prov'd on *Isay.* 7. 14. that this Prophecy of a child that is born, and of Son that is given, can by no means agree with *Hezekias*, who at the taking of *Samaria*, by the *Assyrians*, was one and thirty Years old. A difficulty which cannot be

overcome,

overcome, and was overseen by the learned *Grotius*, from whom thy have borrow'd the objection.

For the *4th*, That it is extravagantly render'd into English: Then the Septuagint are very extravagant, who, contrary to these Gentlemens assertions, who deny that they read the mighty God, have in all the Editions that I have seen, θεὸς ἰσχυρὸς, ὑψιστος, *The strong, the mighty God.* Then St. *Irenæus* is extravagant who reads it thus, *lib.* 4. *c.* 66. Then is the great *Ignatius* extravagant who cites it after the same manner, *Epist. ad Antioch.* Both these Fathers writing long before any of these Disputes. Then is *Procopius* extravagant, who on this very place is positive that the word θεὸς was to be found in his time in the best copies of the Septuagint; and more extravagant again to assert on *Isay.* 10. 21. that the words *mighty God*, in that verse, of which there is no controversie, and are undoubtedly spoken of God, are in the Hebrew, and Greek, the self same as in this place. Then *Theodoret* one of the most learned of the Fathers, and one of the best Criticks is strangely extravagant, who accuses *Aquila* of falsification in rendering the Hebrew without the word *God.* Then *Eusebius* up and down in the Books of the demonstration, who reads as we do, and all the Fathers of the Latin Church after their own Interpreter, who have render'd it thus, not to speak of most translations, are wildly extravagant.

What becomes then of the flourish? Who affects monstrosities? Who is govern'd by the obvious reason and possibility of things? These Gentlemen or we? Is it not more candid and natural, more possible and rational to receive and submit to a plain Text of Scripture, understood as we do by the pious and learned part of mankind; then to strain, and sweat, and drag in rash criticisms and unnatural explications to bring in a Doctrine monstruous and impossible, the meer Humanity of *J. Christ.*

In

In the 11*th.* of *Isaias* is a magnificent description of the Messias, and own'd to be such by the *Rabbins*. It is lookt upon as a proof of his Divinity by most Ancient and Modern Interpreters.

The 1*st* verse is a Prophecy of his coming into the World, and taking our nature. *There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse and a branch shall grow out of his roots.* Which the Apostle Act. 13. v. 23. has shew'd to be verifi'd. *Of this man's seed has God according to his promise rais'd unto Israel a Saviour Jesus.* The 3, 4, 5. Verses open the ends of his coming into the World. The 6, 7, 8, 9. are the happy effects of his Incarnation: The infinite blessings of joy, peace and security adumbrated by the combining together of the most feroce and brutish, with the mildest and fearfullest Creatures. The 10*th* is a conclusion of the whole, and sets before us the Holy *Jesus* as the hope of all Nations. *He shall stand for an ensign of the People, to it shall the Gentiles seek, and his rest shall be glorious.* What can the seeking of the Gentiles, and that glorious rest be, but the addresses of men to him in their humblest adorations; The sending of their Prayers to the throne of his Grace: Their confidence that there is no name under Heaven but his, by which they can be sav'd. This explication is not mine, But St. *Paul's*, who Rom. 15. 12. reading this Text after the Septuagint, says, *There shall be a root of Jesse, and he that shall rise to reign over the Gentiles, in him shall the Gentiles trust.* This is not catching at the word *God*. But I would fain be satisfi'd, If Christ is not God, If he is no more than a meer Creature, whether to hope in him, to trust, that is, to put all our confidence in him, as the Prophet says we shall, and the Apostle we ought to do, is not a most damnable Idolatry.

These Gentlemen having taken no notice of this Text have said nothing to it. They may consult

Grotius

Grotius their Friend in diſtreſs, who againſt invincible reaſons, the expreſs Authority of the Apoſtle, and the ſence of Chriſtian Interpreters explains this Text of *Hezekiah*.

What can be more poſitive than the 35. of Iſai. v. 4. *Say to them that are of a fearful heart, be ſtrong, fear not, behold, your God will come with vengeance, even God with a recompence, he will come and ſave you.* The fifth verſe is a character of his coming which no mortal can perſonate. *Your God* will come with miraculous works, with a divine energy, he will give ſight to the blind, and hearing to the deaf, *&c.* To *Chriſt* do all the Writers of the New Teſtament give Witneſs that he has done all this, and that at the ſame time that he took upon him the form of a ſervant, and the miſeries of a laborious life. *Chriſt* himſelf took no other way to convince the Baptiſt, *Matt.* 11. 4, 5, 6. that he was the expected Saviour, then a lively application of this Text to his diſciples. *Go and ſhew John again thoſe things you do hear and ſee. The blind receive their ſight, The lame walk, the lepers are cleans'd, The deaf hear, The dead are raiſed up, the Poor have the Goſpel preach't to them.* He is God that ſhould come; He is God that ſhould do this. Chriſt is come and has done all this, What conſequence is more natural than that he is truly God?

To this theſe Gentlemen anſwer, Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 20. *1ſt.* That it does not appear that our Saviour intended to quote the words of the Prophet. *2ly.* That admitting he did, God is only ſaid to come to the Jews in his Ambaſſador *Jeſus Chriſt.* And becauſe in him and by him he gave ſight to the blind, *&c.* They cite for this *Joh.* 14. 10. *Act.* 10. 38.

To the *1ſt.* Whether Chriſt intended it or not, is not at all material. What we have to do, is to prove that the Prophecy is fullfill'd in him. If it is, which is undeniable, then he is the God who was to come

come and work theſe miracles in the behalf of mankind. But that he intended it, will appear not only from the exact correſpondency of the Text, but alſo from the conſtant tradition of the Jews, who underſtood this place of the *Meſſias*, and from it concluded, that he was to work Miracles. It was natural therefore in the *Baptiſt*, who could not be ignorant of *Chriſt*'s ſtupendous conception, by which he was deſign'd to his Miraculous performances, to ſend and ask whether he was he that was to come? and as natural to *Chriſt* to give *John* no other anſwer than that thoſe things were done by him, by which the World was to be convinc'd that the *Meſſias* was come.

The 2*d*. that God is come to the Jews in his Ambaſſador and Meſſenger *Chriſt Jeſus*, is a flat denyal to an expreſs Text. The Prophet ſpeaks of an immediate coming, of a perſonal appearance, of a Mighty expectation through the whole world. He who is to come, to appear, to remove that expectation by his glorious preſence, is call'd *our God*. *Our God ſhall come, he ſhall come*. If this be no more than to appear by his Meſſenger, a leſs Prophet would have ſerv'd the turn. Such vehement and poſitive expreſſions can never agree with ſo poor a ſhift. Nor is it at all reconcilable with the opinion of the Jews, who were ſo far perſwaded that the *Meſſias* was a divine perſon, and that he was the God ſpoken of here, that ſeveral of their Doctors have thought, from the laſt verſe of this Chapter, that he ſhould actually deliver them who were already in the place of Eternal Torments.

But what an unlucky ſtrain is the citation of *Joh*. 14. 10. *The Father that dwells in me he does the works*. And *Act*. 10. 38. *God was with him*. Who doubts that God was preſent to the Holy *Jeſus*? who doubts that God was with him, ſince we contend, with all the Fathers and Doctors of the Chriſtian Church, that the

Eternal word of the Father assum'd his nature. The citation of St. *John* absolutely destroys what they would infer from it. *Christ* tells his Disciples that if they had known him, they had known the Father also. *Philip* upon this begs, that he would shew them the Father. *Christ* Answers, he that has seen me has seen the Father. He gives presently the reason of the Answer. *I am in the Father, and the Father in me.* That is, there is in us a distinction of Persons; He is the Father, I am the Son. There is an Unity of nature, I am in him, and he is in me. This is not my own Assertion. *The Father that dwels in me, he does the works.* The works that the Father does in me, are a proof of what I say. He resumes the whole Argument. *Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me. Or else believe me for the very works sake.* Believe me, who say, that it is so with us. But if thou will not believe upon my own Authority be convinc'd by those Miraculous Operations which are an invincible proof of what I say.

The 40*th* Chapter of *Isaias* is to the same purpose, only it seems more plain and expres. It has besides the unanimous consent of the Jews, who understand it to be a Prophecy of the *Messias*. *Christ* is represented here as our God in such expressions as shew the whole Oeconomy of the Gospel, and are applicable to no Mortal Man. So great a truth is usher'd in with a splendid Preface, Verse 3, 4, 5. by which the four Evangelists have prov'd the *Mission* of *John* the *Baptist*, the forerunner of *Christ*; in which we have the advantage, that the proof of the one is a proof of the other. *O Jerusalem that bringest good tidings, lift up thy Voice with strength ..... say to the Cities of Judah, behold your God. Behold the Lord God will come with strong hand ..... He shall feed his flock like a Shepherd, He shall gather the Lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom.* Christ then is *the Lord God* seen by the

Cities

Cities of *Judah*. To him the character of ſtrength does agree, who was to conquer the Prince of this World. *Joh.* 12. 31. To him does that of the Shepherd anſwer exactly, who ſaid of himſelf, *Joh.* 10. 11. *I am the good ſhepherd*; of whom St. *Paul* ſaid, *Heb.* 13. 20. that he is *the great ſhepherd of the ſheep.* and St. *Peter*, 1. *pet.* 2. 25. *The ſhepherd and Biſhop of our Souls.* Nor can it be ſo much as pretended here, that God came in his Ambaſſador and Meſſenger *Chriſt Jeſus.* That wild notion has not ſo much as the leaſt place here. *The Lord God*, who was to come, was to be ſeen by the Cities of *Judah*. He was to be preceded, and have his ways prepar'd by the Illuſtrious Forerunner. The *Baptiſt* who was inveſted in that glorious office was on that very account call'd, *Luk.* 2. 67. *The Prophet of the Higheſt.* Let any one compare candidly theſe expreſſions, *The Lord God*, and *the Higheſt. Eſay* ſays, the Lord God will come. *Zacharias* ſays, *And thou child ſhalt be called the Prophet of the Higheſt, for thou ſhalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways.* The *Baptiſt* was the immediate Prophet of *Chriſt*. Chriſt was the *Lord* whoſe ways he was to prepare. That Lord is the *Higheſt* whoſe Prophet he was, and the *Lord God*, who was to be ſeen, and whoſe ways were to be prepar'd. This is another place which theſe Gentlemen have taken no notice of, and ſo have ſaid nothing to it.

The 45*th* of *Eſay* is wholly taken up to prove the unity of the divine nature. *v.* 6. 18, 22. *I am the Lord and there is none elſe*, *I am God and there is none elſe*, oppoſing in this the vanity, and multiplicity of the Gods of the Heathen. As a conſequence of that Unity, the Almighty challenges the praiſes and adorations of all his Creatures. *v.* 23. *I have ſworn by my ſelf—that unto me every Knee ſhall bow and every tongue ſhall ſwear.* This is ſo eſſential a prerogative of the Divine Majeſty, that to apply our ſelves to any crea-

ture is a Sin; To adore any other being is an invasion of his right over us. It is to multiply, and consequently, as much as lyes in us, to destroy the Deity: Therefore either Christ is God, or St. *Paul* a writer divinely inspir'd contradicts all this. Since *Rom.* 14. 10, 11. he layes down as a fundamental truth, *that we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. For it is written, As I live, says the Lord, every Knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God.* God alone then is the object of our Religion. To bow to any other, to praise, or adore any other, for this is the sence of confessing here, is Impiety, Sacrilege, and Idolatry. And yet St. *Paul* assures us, that there is a time where Christ is publickly, and solemnly to receive the praises and adorations of all Men. Therefore Christ must be God, and even that God, who says positively that he is God, and that besides him there is none else.

The Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 20. has as odd a sort of an Answer to this as was that of God's coming into the World by his Ambassador *Christ*. He tells us that, "Christ indeed is to be a judge, but "not as God: But only acting by a Commission from "God. That Men will appear before him as we do "before the judges of the land, who act in the name "of our sovereign Lord the King.

This witty shift is perhaps one of the most unreasonable things in the World. It is true that the honour paid to the judges here is resolv'd into the Authority from whence their power is deriv'd. But Christ is judge as he is God. He does that which no Man can do by Commission, and it is the great qualification of the most Hight, to search the Hearts, try the Reins, and to have darkness as light as the day. None but God can find the evidence in the heart of the Guilty. He must be Omniscient and Omnipresent who opens the secrets of the hearts of all Men, and calls

calls them to an account for those Sins, infinite for their multitude, incredible for their variety, and incomprehensible for their mysteriousness. This the Apostle acknowledges, and to this he appeals. 1 Cor. 4. 5. *Therefore judge nothing before the time, untill the Lord cometh, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart.* He that is our Judge, St. *John* calls expressly our God, in that dreadfull description of the last day. *Rev.* 20. 11, 12. *And I saw a great white throne; and him that sat on it, from whose face the Heaven and the earth fled away, and I saw the dead great and small stand before God.*

In the 23. of *Jeremy* both the Character and the name of the *Messias*, are so fully expresst, that the most famous *Rabbins* have oppos'd the corrupt reading which some obstinate Jews would have forc't on this Text. The Generality of Christian Interpreters, ancient and modern, have understood it of *Christ*, and receiv'd the noble Prophecy, not only as a proof of his birth and office, but also of his Divinity. The 14. *verse* calls him *a righteous Branch* the usual name of the *Messias* in the Prophets. He is said to be rais'd to *David* as a great King, who shall Reign, and Prosper, and Execute Judgment and Justice in the Earth. In the 15. v. Salvation is promis'd by him to *Judah* and *Israel*: and to shew that this will certainly come to pass, and that nothing can prevent it, The Prophet tells them, who is that righteous Branch, that admirable King, who is to entail on them an Eternal peace: and this is his name whereby he shall be call'd, *The Lord our righteousness.* That he is to be a Man who is to effect all this, is plain from the letter and sence of the Text. He must be of the seed of *David.* He must execute justice and judgment upon earth. That he is God cannot be deny'd from these two expressions. The one is, the *Jehovah*, the ineffable

name of God given him. The other, *our righteousness*, a title which no creature can pretend to. As a confirmation of this, read *Daniel* 9. 24. where the coming of the *Messias* is express'd *by bringing in Everlasting Righteousness*. And 1 *Cor.* 1. 30. *Jesus Christ is made to us righteousness*. If he is no more than a Creature, how can he become our righteousness, how can he bring Everlasting Righteousness? Can any Man justifie another, or procure to him an Everlasting State of Holiness and Blessedness? What opinion soever we may have of the greatest and best of Men, we cannot but be satisfi'd that those acts of omnipotency are above the reach of any Creature. The very sence of the corruption of our nature, the very apprehensions that we are finite beings give the lye to all those little notions, and we are forc't to look to *the Lord* The *Jehovah* for Pardon and Happiness.

The Author of the Brief Hist. pag. 20. opposes to this; 1*st*, That "*Grotius* has shew'd that the *Branch* "here intended is *Zorobabel*. 2*ly*, That these words, "*This is the name whereby he shall be call'd*, are spoken "neither of Christ nor of *Zorobabel*, but of *Israel*. "3*ly*, This is prov'd by a place parallel to this, *Jer.* "33. 15, 16. Where *Jerusalem* is call'd *The Lord* "*our righteousness*. *In those days shall Judah be sav'd,* "*and Jerusalem shall dwell safely; and this is the name* "*whereby She shall be call'd, The Lord our righteousness.*

To the 1*st*, *Grotius* has not only against him the unanimous consent of the Fathers, but he is also unhappy in this, that of all the senses that this Prophecy can bear it is not capable of that of *Zorobabel*. How can *Zorobabel* be the *Branch*, a name constantly appropriated to the *Messias*? *Esay*, 11. 1. *Esay*, 4. 2. *Zech.* 3. 8. and the 6. 12. *Luk.* 1. 78. and never to him? How can, according to the excellent observation of *Theodoret* on this place, *Zorobabel* be a King that should actually reign and make his People for ever

happy,

happy, who neither was a King, nor ever reign'd over the Jews, nor ever ſate in the Throne of *David*?

To the 2*d*, That the name of *the Lord our righteouſneſs* is neither given to *Chriſt*, nor to *Zorobabel*, but to *Iſrael*. This is another ſtrain of *Grotius*, and as unſucceſsful as the other. 1*ſt*, It is againſt the ſence of the Jewiſh Doctors. 2*ly*, It is againſt the plain letter of the Hebrew. 3*ly*, It is againſt the ſence of all Mankind, and theſe Gentlemen are not modeſt to pretend to impoſe at this dreadful rate. Is it not as clear as the Sun, that the deſign of this Text is to tell us what this King ſhall do, what he is, what he ſhall be call'd? Will it ever enter into any Man's head who is not quite mad, that *Iſrael*, or *Judah*, for if it is applicable to the one, it is alſo to the other, and not the *Branch*, the Prince is here deſcrib'd. 4*ly*, It is againſt the true reading of the Septuagint, and the old Latin Tranſlation.

To the 3*d*, that is, *Jer.* 33. 15. 16. granting the reading of the Text as it is in our Bible, which indeed the Hebrew favours, It is ſo far parallel to this, as to be a renewing of the promiſe made by God in the place already cited. The ſence of the Prophet is, that *Jeruſalem* ſhall be call'd *the Lord our righteouſneſs* by containing him, that is, being fill'd with his glorious preſence who is really *the Lord our righteouſneſs*. As *Jacob* Gen. 33. 20. erected an Altar and call'd it *Et-elohe-Iſrael*, *God the God of Iſrael*. And *Ezek.* 48. 35. and the name of the City from that day ſhall be *Jehovah ſhammah*, *the Lord is there*.

But what can be more poſitive and home to the queſtion than the teſtimony of *Baruch* chap. 3. the 3. laſt verſes? *This is our God, and there ſhall be no other accounted in compariſon of him. He has found out all the way of Knowledge, and has given it to Jacob his ſervant, and to Iſrael his beloved. Afterwards did he ſhew himſelf upon earth and converſt with Men.* To

offer an enlargment on this Text is to do it an injury. The 1*ſt* of theſe verſes aſſerts the unity of God. The 2*d* his great wiſdom and goodneſs to his people. The 3*d* his viſible appearing to us in our nature; and this not by a ſudden apparition, vaniſhing as ſoon as it is offer'd; and leaving the Soul in ſuſpence about the truth of the object, but by a continu'd living on the Earth. If there be but one Perſon in God, as theſe Gentlemen ſo ſtiffly maintain, and that is, the Father; there muſt have been an Incarnation of that Perſon, ſince he has appear'd upon Earth, and convers'd with men; which they, and with a great deal of Reaſon, will by no means admit. But the whole Scripture ſays, That God has ſent his Son into the World; That he has appear'd to put away Sin; and we all agree that the *Holy Jeſus* is that Son. How then can we deny his Divinity, ſince it is ſaid of him who has thus appear'd, *This is our God, and there ſhall be no other accounted in compariſon of him.*

This is ſo expreſs, that we muſt not expect to be put off with *Grotius*; or *Chriſt* being call'd *God*, as *Moſes*, or *Solomon*; or the rare Notion of God coming to us in his Ambaſſadour *Jeſus*. Nothing of this will do; and therefore the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 22. anſwers, firſt, That the Book is Apocryphal. Secondly, That thoſe who admit the Book, reject thoſe verſes as ſuppoſititious. Thirdly, That the Original Greek may be render'd, *Afterwards this Book of the Commandments of God, and the Law which endures for ever, was ſeen upon Earth, and turn'd over by men.*

Firſt, That the Book is Apocryphal, is an Anſwer cannot be made by theſe Gentlemen, becauſe it is cited againſt them by the whole Societies of Chriſtians who believe it to be Canonical. But freely granting that the Book is ſuch; I muſt beg leave to ſay, That it is nothing to the purpoſe. Any man of ordinary

reading

reading knows that Apocryphal signifies no more, than ἀπόκρυφος & *Uncanonical*, or out of the Canon of the Sacred Books. That sort of Writings, though not kept in *Armario*, as *Tertullian* expresses it, *cap.* 3. *de hab. muli.* yet were look'd upon with much reverence by them, and particularly by the *Hellenists*. They were daily in their hands, and the greatest Authority in the World, next to the uncontested Scriptures. There is a vast difference between being uncanonical and rejected; and the saying, That this Passage is taken out of an uncanonical, though a Sacred Book, takes nothing off the force of the Objection. These Gentlemen who are so pleas'd with Criticisms, that it will with them bear down the plainest Authority in the World, must give me leave to Criticize for once. I say then, That of all the Apocryphal Books, none was so like to become Canonical as that of *Baruch*. It is somewhat more than a probable Conjecture, that this Book was once read with that of *Jeremy*; whose Disciple *Baruch* was. The ninth of *Daniel* has lead several Learned men into that Opinion. For after he has cited *Jeremy*, *v.* 2. and began that fervent Prayer for the preservation of *Jerusalem*; He seems to transcribe *Baruch*. Compare *Baruch* 1. 15, 16, 17. with *Daniel* 7, 8, *&c.* *Baruch* 2. 7, 8, 9. with *Daniel* 9. 13, *&c.* *Baruch* 2. 11, *&c.* with *Daniel* 9. 15. *Baruch* 2. 15. with *Daniel* 9. 18. I will add to confirm this, That several of the most ancient and Primitive Fathers have often cited *Jeremy*, and yet the Texts us'd by them were taken out of *Baruch*, which gives some ground to believe, that the Works of these two Prophets were once joyn'd together.

To the second Objection we must be forc'd to say, That no part of it is true. First, it is not true that ever those Verses were look'd upon as suppositious by them who either admitted, or rejected the Book. Secondly, it is not true that ever these words were a

marginal

marginal Note, no ancient Copy being without them, and the rest being only Conjecture instead of Reason.

The third Objection is the highest Unsincerity imaginable. Their Translation is forc'd, unnatural, and what is worse, notoriously false. There is nothing in the Text of a Book of Commands, or of a Law which endures for ever. There is only ὁδον διδάσκων, *viam disciplinæ*, as the Vulgar translates it. To say, not what they have pretended to impose, without either Reason, or Truth; but what can be strain'd from this, That the way of Knowledge has shew'd *Himself* to men, and convers'd with them, is a bold and ridiculous way of Translating.

The fifth Chapter of *Micah* is an eminent Prophecy of Christ. The first part of the second Verse gives an account of his Birth, and of the place to which God had promis'd so great a Blessing. *But thou Bethlehem Ephratah, though thou be little amongst the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be Ruler in Israel.* The second part soars higher, and tells us, That though he is born as a man, yet he has that which no man can pretend to; and though he has such a visible Being, yet he has another which is invisible and eternal; *whose goings forth have been from old, from everlasting*, or, *From the days of Eternity.* This Text has a double advantage: First, that the *Chaldee Paraphrast*, the *Thalmud*, and the generality of the ancient Jews have follow'd in this the sence of their Forefathers, and understood this Text of the *Messiah*. Secondly, that from *Mat.* 2. 6. and *Joh.* 7. 42. this invincibly appears to have been the Tradition of the Jews; one of the great Obstacles to their Belief, that he was the *Messias*, having no other ground, than that contrary to the received Opinion, That the *Messias* was to be a Bethlehemite, they thought the *Holy Jesus* a Galilean.

If

If then Christ is the *Messias*, as no Christian has yet doubted, no not these Gentlemen themselves. These things appear very plain. The one, that he is born at *Bethlehem*. The other, that he existed before all time; *from the days of Eternity*. He cannot have that existence as man: for as such, it is visible that he had a beginning. He was born at *Bethlehem*. Therefore if he did inhabit Eternity, or if his goings have been from Eternity, before he came to be born at *Bethlehem*, He must be a Divine Person, and consequently God.

The Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 21. answers, first, that the Hebrew reads *from ancient days*, and not, *from everlasting*. *Grotius* must also come in, or else they durst not venture upon the Interpretation. He makes the ancient days his Descent, or Pedigree, being descended of the most ancient Stock of *David*, of *Bethlehem*. Secondly, that *Calvin* makes the sence to be, *Whose goings forth have been decreed from the days of Eternity*. The Answerer to Mr. *Milbourn* has said the same things, only challenging him to try his skill on these Solutions.

To the first. These Gentlemen must give me leave to say, That they have done *Grotius* an injury. That Learned person never understood the words of the *Messias*, but of *Zorobabel*. It is no wonder then, if taking the Text to be spoken of him, he was forc'd to put an unnatural sence upon it. It is easie to run from one Errour to another. The first Errour of *Grotius* was to have apply'd this Prophecy of one who was to be born at *Bethlehem*, to one who was really born in *Babylon*. An Objection not to be overcome, and substantially propos'd by *Theodoret* on this place. The second was, to have strain'd the Letter of this Text to a mean and senseless Allegory. How ridiculous is it to fansie a Descent, or a Pedigree enlarg'd upon by the Prophet, when the most ignorant

Jew

Jew knew that the *Messias* was to be the Son of *David*? The 7. verse of the 53. of *Isaias* is parallel to this. *Who shall declare his generation?* If no more be meant by this, than that *Christ* is of the Seed of *David*, and born of a Virgin, there is no ground for such a vehement Exclamation. To be of a Race is natural to all men. To be born of a Virgin is indeed miraculous, but yet highly comprehensible, since it is easie to imagine; how he that could create a man out nothing, can produce a man without the mixture of Sexes. What is then this Generation which cannot be declar'd, because it is incomprehensible? Would it not fill any rational man with indignation, and particularly a Jew, to tell him that it is a Descent and a Pedigree, an old Stock of Nobility; and that the days of Eternity are no more than the ancient days, that is, a certain Computation of years. Whereas this Generation, or as *Micah* expresses it, these goings forth are before days and years; *From the beginning, from of old, from Eternity*, and consequently cannot be declar'd by any Creature.

But after all, with the leave of *Grotius*, and of these Gentlemen, this Text is capable of no such Translation. There is a repetition in it, which must be render'd, from the beginning, from everlasting, the Dialect of Scripture to express not the length, but the infinite duration of time. I wonder that they did not perceive, That *from ancient days, and from ancient days*, which is the Translation of *Grotius*, is both an ill sound and an ill sence.

To the second, that is, *Calvin* saying, That the goings forth of *Christ have been decreed by God* from the days of Eternity, I think to be, if possible more unreasonable than *Grotius*. I take what they make him say, upon their Credit. All that is not in it liable to Exception, is that the Learned man has not presum'd to alter the ancient Reading; but with all

the

the Fathers, and most Translators reads *From the days of Eternity*. The rest contradicts it self. Had *Calvin* said, That God had decreed that *Christ* should be born at *Bethlehem*, as he may be said to have decreed the Event of all Prophecies, and St. *Peter* says, *Acts* 2. 23. That he determined the Death of the *Holy Jesus*; there had been nothing in this but what is true and rational. But to say that God has decreed from Eternity, of one who is from Eternity; That God has decreed from Eternity his Eternal Nature, who is spoken of here in the Text, is a rare way of expressing ones self. To overthrow a plain and easie interpretation, another is substituted, which says that God has decreed from Eternity the goings forth of the Lord Christ, that is, that God has decreed from all Eternity, that *Christ* should be born from all Eternity.

I cannot but admire that these Gentlemen should think their Solutions so solid, as to challenge Mr. *Milbourn* to try his skill on them. If they have no better Answers, I wish them well out of the hands of Dr.——

Let us pass to *Haggai*, who in the second Chapter of his Prophecy, *v.* 5. and *fol.* has these words: *According to the word that I covenanted with you, when you came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remains among you, fear you not. For thus says the Lord of Hosts, Yet once it is a little while, and I will shake the Heavens, and the Sea, and the dry Land, and I will shake all Nations, and the desire of all Nations shall come, and I will fill this house with Glory, says the Lord of Hosts. The Silver is mine, and the Gold is mine. The Glory of this latter house shall be greater than the former, says the Lord of Hosts, and in this place will I give peace, says the Lord of Hosts.*

That these Words are spoken to *Zorobabel* and *Joshua*, appears from the second verse of this Chapter.

From

From the 3. That the Temple mention'd here, is the second Temple, which compar'd to the former, *was as nothing*: Agreeable to the relation made *Ezr.* 3. 23. The Old men who had seen the one answering only with their Tears and Cryes, the loud Acclamations of the younger people for raising of the other.

From 4, 5. That God had promis'd them by *Moses* another Prophet to whom they should hearken, *Deut.* 18. 15.

From the 6. That to usher him into the World, the Heavens, *&c.* should be shaken; that is, all that Dispensation under which they liv'd, that very Temple wherein they worshipp'd. Which Interpretation of this Verse, is that of the Author of the Epistle the *Hebrews*, *Chap.* 12. 26.

From the 7, 8. That then the *Messiah* should come, known by the Character of the *desire of the Nations*, The *Shilo* propheſied by *Jacob*, *Gen.* 49. 10.

From the 9. That for that very Reason the Glory of that Temple should far exceed even that, which surpass'd all the places of the Earth, by which God was known to inhabit *Judea*, and to love the Tabernacles of *Jacob*; The Temple built by *Solomon*.

There must be that then in the *Messias*, whom we all acknowledge to be the *Holy Jesus*, which makes the Glory of this latter Temple to exceed that of the former. I take this to be the stress of the Question. To think that the difference lies in the Building and Architecture, as some have fansied, of the Temple built afterwards by *Herod*, or even of the duration of this, which is the Opinion of some Jews, does not deserve any consideration.

It is said then of the former Temple, that the Almighty did appear *by a Cloud*; That he sent a Fire to consume the Sacrifices, and this with so great a sence of his Presence, that 2 *Chron.* 5, 7. Chapters,

it

it is repeated four times, that the Glory of the Lord fill'd the House: An Argument not only of his approving what they did; but even of being himself amongst them. How could then the Glory of the second Temple be made greater by the Coming of the *Messias*? For granting that the Spirit of God did inhabit in *Christ* in a vast measure; That he wrought Miracles, and pleas'd God by the great Holiness of his Life; yet this at most but equals the frequent and glorious appearing of God himself.

Nothing can justifie the Assertion of the Prophet but this; That God in the second Temple is become visible, appearing to men in their own Nature: That having sent his only Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, he has consecrated this second House with his Blood. That by assuming our Nature, he has made good his Promises, and shew'd himself glorious, not only in a small corner of the Earth, and for a short time, but establish'd an endless Kingdom, and procur'd ro men an incomprehensible Glory. Hence *Christ* is call'd by *David*, *Psal.* 23. 7. *The King*, and by the Apostle, 1 *Cor.* 2. 8. *The Lord of Glory*, two of the most High God's Qualifications.

The Author of the Brief Hist. has taken no notice of this place; but the Lord Bishop of *Sarum* having made use of it in a Book or Sermon, which I have not seen, I find that what they say to it, *Consider at. on the Explicat. of the Doctr. of the Holy Trin. pag.* 24, 25. amounts to this: 1*st*, That my Lord is mistaken, to think the word *Glory* in the second Temple alludes to the Cloud of Glory in the first. 2*ly*, that My Lord has added *His* to the Text, led to it by that chimerical mistake. 3*ly*. That the meaning is plain, They have built as well as they could considering the streight they were in. But that God in due time will cause this house to be more magnificent even then that built by *Solomon*. 4*ly*, That admitting My Lord's opinion

opinion that God has appear'd in the Person of our Saviour in whom the Majesty of God dwelt Bodily, the Temple would not be more glorious than any other place where Christ resorted; But particularly because Christ never enter'd into the Temple. 5*ly*. That this Prophecy was fullfill'd in the rebuilding of the second Temple by *Herod*.

To the 1*st*, I say that the sacred writer in speaking of the Glory of the second Temple, must allude to the cloud of Glory of the first, or else he is not intelligible. This is evident, if the Glory of the first Temple has no other foundation then the appearing of God in the cloud of Glory. But that it is so, is undenyable; since all the excellence of a building of that nature consists neither in the magnificence of the structure, nor the rarity and beauty of the pieces of which it is made; But only in God's acceptation. The burning bush was certainly more glorious then the palace of the *Pharao*'s. The cloud of Glory was a sign that God was pleas'd with the erecting of a House which himself had required. Therefore the cloud of Glory, was the true and principal Glory of the first House. That it is so of the second appears from that magnificent preface of shaking the Heavens and the earth, and of bringing in the desire of the Nations, and then the promise of filling the House with Glory. This proves invincibly, that as God appearing in the cloud of Glory was the Glory of the first; so the appearing of the *Messias*, the desire of the Nations, was the Glory of this second House.

To the 2*d* then. The Bishop did not undeservedly add the word, *His*, but follow'd the sence of the words: For if God's appearing in the Cloud made it *His* Glory; His appearing in the Messias must make it *His* Glory too.

To the 3*d*. It is altogether wide of the question. 1*st*, The Glory of the Lord was not only visible to the

the Priests and Ministers of the Altar, but to all the Children of *Israel*. 2. *Chr.* 7. 3. 2*ly*, It was not only in the *Holy of Holies*, or where the Priests Minister'd, but it was *upon the house*. Thus Christ the Glory of the second house appear'd to all the people, and did those Miracles which no Man can do, except God be with him. *Job.* 2. 3. 3*ly*, It is visible that the Glory promis'd to the Temple is not so much to the Temple it self, as to the time of its standing, since the Temple it self was to be destroy'd. A substantial observation, and strangely overlook'd by these Gentlemen. That time was to be more glorious by bringing in a dispensation of Eternal righteousness: By putting an end to all Types and Figures: By fullfilling of God's Promises: by introducing into the World the desire of the Nations. *Heb.* 12.27. *And this word* once more, *signifies the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain.*

To the 4*th*, It deserves no answer. These Gentlemen are positive in things, which are really very disputable. The modern Jews may be of their opinion; The Ancient were not. That *Herod* the Great rebuilt the second Temple is assur'd by them, but flatly deny'd by *Josephus Ant. Jud. lib.* 15.c. 14. They say that it is confess't by all to have excell'd that of *Solomon*; But this is flatly contradicted by several learned Men, and, I think, to the purpose by *Villapandus*, Tom. 3. in *Ezech.*

In a word; These Gentlemen imagine in the place before cited, that this noble Prophecy amounts to no more than this..... "We have not so much Money as "*Solomon*, but we have done what we can: God will "provide us more, and then we shall do better. *Confid. pag.* 24. How can Men of sence and learning espouse such comical Interpretations? If they are in earnest, what must we think of them? And if they

are not, let them consider that God is not to be mock't.

The whole Prophecy of *Zechariah* seems to have no other end, but to discover the *Messiah* to the World. His Divine nature is so fully expres's't in the second Chapter that it is above the reach of any little Criticisms or evasions whatsoever. The four first verses announce to *Jerusalem* that it shall be built again, and to its people, that they shall inhabit it. The 6, 7. are a repeated assurance that God will put an end to their Captivity. The 8. is a solemn Declaration that he is resolv'd to protect them. *The Lord of Hosts* assures them that he is sent to revenge their quarrel; and *v.* 9. that he will certainly do it, and that they shall evidently see that he is sent *by the Lord of Hosts. For thus says the Lord of Hosts, After the Glory has he sent me to the Nations which spoil'd you—— For behold, I will shake my hand upon them, and they shall be a spoil to their servants, and you shall know that the Lord of Hosts has sent me.* That *the Lord of Hosts* is the Almighty; That he, and none but he, assumes that name is granted of all sides. It is also granted, that God is one, and that besides him, There is no God. And yet this Text represents *The Lord of Hosts* sending *The Lord of Hosts.* An expression parallel to that of *Ps.* 110. 1. *The Lord said to my Lord.* It must be said then, that though a plurality of Gods is inconsistent, yet certainly the Divine Nature admits of more than one Divine Person. It must be confest, that *The Lord of Hosts*, who sends, is the Father: That *The Lord of Hosts*, who is sent, is the Eternal Word the Son: and that though there is but one God; yet that Revelation which he has made of himself tells us, that there is several Persons in that one God.

The Author of the Brief Hist. pag 22. answers *1st*, That these words as they are in the Latin, and English are hardly sense. *2ly*, That neither of these words,

thus

thus ſays the Lord of Hoſts are words of the Lord of Hoſts himſelf, but of the ſecond Angel, who at *v.* 3, 4. ſpoke to the firſt Angel and to *Zechariah*. *3ly*, That the verſes ſhould have been thus render'd from the Hebrew. *Thus ſays the Lord of Hoſts, afterwards ſhall be Glory*, inſtead of, *after the Glory i. e.* after you are departed out of *Babylon*, v. 7. you ſhall have honour and peace, *and you ſhall know that the Lord of Hoſts has ſent me*, *i. e.* to puniſh them and give you peace and glory.

To the *1ſt*, and, *3d*, It is hard to accuſe Tranſlations exactly agreeable to the Original of Hardly being ſence, when they cannot be made to bear with our opinions. In this the Author is unhappy that the letter of this Text is plain, and has ſcarce any difficulty. What he ſays, *afterwards ſhall be glory*, may be a ſort of a Paraphraſe, but is certainly no Tranſlation. But the weakneſs of this will be evident by the reply.

To the *2d*, He inſiſts, that *Thus ſays the Lord Hoſts*, are not the words of *the Lord of Hoſts himſelf*, but of the ſecond Angel who ſpeaks to the firſt. I beg to know whether it is the Lord of Hoſts who ſays v. 10. 11. *Sing and rejoice O Daughter of Sion, for lo I come, and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, ſays the Lord.* Can any one who is not obſtinately reſolv'd to contradict all mankind, ſay, that it is an Angel ſpeaking to another. *And many Nations ſhall be join'd to the Lord in that day, and ſhall be my people: and I will dwell in the midſt of thee, and thou ſhall know that the Lord of Hoſts has ſent me.* Is it not he who is ſent by the Lord of Hoſts, whoſe people they ſhall be: who will dwell in the midſt of them? Once more, is it an Angel to whom many Nations ſhall be join'd; and who will take them for his people? He that ſpeaks is without any evaſion *the Lord of Hoſts*, and He plainly and poſitively declares, that *the Lord of Hoſts has ſent him.* This Author did catch at a kind of a Notion which he thought

to find in the Verſes before, but is ſo abſolutely overthrown by theſe laſt, that no rational ſolution can be offer'd to them. This is one of the Hammering Texts urg'd by the Fathers againſt the *Arrians*, and underſtood by the Jews of the *Meſſiah*.

The 12*th*, of *Zechariah* not only repreſents Chriſt as God, but even God ſuffering for us. It ſuppoſes his Incarnation and conſequently the union of the two natures; and the Divinity being impaſſible it ſhews palpably that he has aſſum'd a body to ſuffer in. It is one of thoſe Texts which prove themſelves and are plainer than any ſort of Explication. *v.* 10. The Almighty ſpeaks thus, *I will pour upon the Houſe of David, and upon the Inhabitants of Jeruſalem the ſpirit of Grace and ſupplications; and they ſhall look upon me whom they have pierc't.* That none but the only true God pours the ſpirit of Grace and ſupplications is indiſputably true. It is the act of an infinite power, and mercy which can be in none but him; and yet that very God ſays, that they have pierc't *him*.

To prevent the underſtanding of this Allegorically piercing him with our ſins as the Jews did of old, and of late in the perſon of *Chriſt*, which is the poor ſhift of the Author of the Brief Hiſt. pag. 22. of *Grotius* before him, and of the Blaſphemous *Theodore* of *Mopſweſt* before *Grotius*; St. *John* tells us who is he that has been, and ſhall be ſeen thus pierc't, Rev. 1. 7. *Behold he comes with Clouds and every eye ſhall ſee him, and they alſo which pierc't him*; A deſcription of Chriſt coming to judge the World. It is to give God the lye to ſay that he has not been pierc't ſince he does ſo poſitively aſſure it. *They ſhall look on me whom they have pierc't.* But the Scripture ſhews this to have been done in Chriſt, Therefore Chriſt is that God who has been pierc't.

Theſe Gentlemen will ſay No: Becauſe God may ſay that he has been pierc'd; and *Chriſt* too may have been

been pierc'd and yet be no God. But if it can be prov'd that this is a direct Prophecy of *Christ*, that the *Me* where lyes the ſtreſs of the argument is ſpoken of *Chriſt* and of none elſe, it muſt be litterally true, that he has been pierc'd and that he is God.

The famous paſſage of *Joh.* 19.37. is expreſs to this. TheEvangeliſt having ſhew'd all along the accompliſhment of Prophecies in *Chriſt*; fixes to him the ſence of this place. *And again another Scripture ſays, they ſhall look on him whom they have pierc'd.* This is ſo deciſive of the queſtion that the Author of the Brief Hiſt. pag 22. reduces himſelf to this miſerable ſhift, that this is appli'd to, but not interpreted of *Chriſt*.

Theſe Gentlemen who pretend ſo much to reaſon are now and then unreaſonable. Can any thing be appli'd to *Chriſt*, and not interpreted of him; or interpreted, and not appli'd to him? They complain that we talk gibbriſh, and have a jargon of our own. Pray what is this? Or will they ſay that it is only to allude at the place of the Prophet, and not to interpret? who can advance this with any candor that reads the place cited? St. *John* has prov'd all along that Chriſt is the *Meſſias*, the perſon promis'd by the Holy Prophets ever ſince the world began. In the Hiſtory of his paſſion he ſhews that he has ſuffer'd nothing but what was foretold by the Spirit of God: The caſting lots on his veſture *v.* 24. The calling for drink, *v.* 28. *That the ſcripture*, ſays the Evangeliſt, *might be fullfill'd.* And immediately before the Text in diſpute, *For theſe things were done that the Scripture ſhould be fullfill'd.* What is to interpret a Prophecy but to ſhew its accompliſhment? how can God better juſtify his ſervants the Prophets, then by fullfilling viſibly what they have foretold?

Malachy is another witneſs of that ſacred truth which God has deliver'd to Mankind. Mat. 3. 1. *I will ſend my Meſſenger and he ſhall prepare the way before*

me: And the Lord whom you expect shall suddenly come to his Temple. That by the Lord who is to come to his Temple *God* is understood, is agreed by all Interpreters. Parallel to this is, *Isay* 40. 3. *The voice of him that cryes in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord: Make strait in the desert a high way for our God.* The learned Rabbins *Maimon.* and *Kimchi* are positive that this Prophecy regards none but the *Messiah.* St. *Jerom* affirms in *Mal.* 3. 1. that the old Jews were of the same mind. This is put out of doubt by the authority of the New Testament; The sacred Writers understanding one part of the Prophecy of John the *Baptist*, and the other of *Christ*, *Matt.* 11. 10. *Mark* 1. 2. *Luk.* 1. 76. and 7. 27. The Lord then is God who should come to his Temple. It is our God to whom the way was to be prepar'd. But both these are said of Christ by the testimony of the Evangelists and the consent of the Jewish Writers. Therefore *Christ* is *the Lord, Christ is our God.*

The Author of the Brief Hist. pag. 22. brings again the rare notion of God coming by his Ambassador *Jesus*, of which we have taken notice already. He has another singular imagination, and would have this to be said of *Nehemias.* But this being without any warrant, reason, example, or authority of any note does not deserve a reply.

Many more Texts might be added to these; But a letter must not swell into a volume, and I am affraid I have been already too tedious to you. But yet before I conclude you must give me leave to say by way of Appendix to what has been laid before you, that of all those Gentlemens answers none is so weak, so insufficient and short of the thing propos'd, as that to an objection of the Dean of *Pauls*, that "Socinianism "makes the Jewish Oeconomy unreasonable and unac-"countable. Observat. On Dr. *Sherlock's* Anſ. *pag.* 45. and *foll.* I have not seen the *Dean's* Book, and I take

take what they make him ſay upon their own credit. But there is more even in that, than has been, or can be anſwer'd. They call it *Trifling*. But upon the leaſt conſideration it muſt be own'd that the anſwer and not the objection is the trifle. The *Dean* ſays, that if *Chriſt* were no more then a meer Man, the Antitype ſhould fall very ſhort of the Types contain'd in the Old Teſtament; that is, the Figures ſhould far excel that of which they are Figures; and *Moſes* his diſpenſation ſhould be far more glorious than that of *Chriſt*; which if it be not an abſurdity nothing in the world can be abſurd. I will preſume to add to what the *Dean* ſays, that this is viſible. For how can it be conceiv'd that the Old Teſtament is an introduction to the New; That from the Creation of the World to the coming of *Chriſt* every thing, every perſon, every inſtitution, or tranſaction ſhould be a Figure; That *Moſes* ſhould be a Figure, the Temple a Figure, in a word, that whole diſpenſation a Figure, which are all the aſſertions of the Fathers and yet deny'd by no Chriſtians; and yet all this ſo magnify'd by the Prophets, look'd upon with ſuch an expectation by the Jews, even reverenc'd by the Heathen, atteſted by God himſelf; who at ſundry times, and in divers manners ſpeaking to the Fathers by the Prophets has at laſt ſpoke to us by his own Son; That thoſe ſplendid promiſes, thoſe ſtupendous miracles, thoſe incomprehenſible methods of the Almighty, thoſe repeated raptures and diſcoveries of the Prophets, thoſe mighty characters of him that was to come; That all this ſhould end in the appearing of a meer Man who by the Holineſs of his Life ſhould be acceptible to God, is, in the modeſt terms of the *Dean*, very unaccountible. It is a great truth that nothing can ſo effectualy ridicule the Jewiſh diſpenſation as this.

The Anſwerer has ſaid nothing to this, and has

not so much as taken notice of it. And indeed he is to be commended; the objection is great and substantial. It does not lye within the reach of a small criticism, and comparing a Text or two together, and then saying *How can this be?*

The *Dean* of *Pauls* having laid this principle, of twenty instances which he might have given, has chosen this, of God's dwelling in the Tabernacle, or in the Temple by the visible symbols of his presence. He argues from thence very rationally that the God who fills Heaven and earth with his presence, must have prefigur'd something more Divine and mysterious by dwelling in a house made with hands. He urges that a *Typical* presence can be a Figure of nothing but a real presence and God's personal dwelling amongst Men: Nothing answering to a Figurative visible presence of God, but a personal visible presence. All this is just and coherent. He says that the Man *Christ Jesus* was really the Temple which the Divinity chose to inhabit. The Antitype of that Temple where God made himself visible: That Christ with a great deal of reason call'd his body a Temple, since God did appear so eminently in him.

All this is so true that they have not one word to say to it. Their exclaiming against Allegories and the instance of the Ark are wide of the thing. The prodigious inclination of the Israelites to Idolatry being the reason of the visible Symbols of God's Presence is a new and at best a slender notion. The Metaphorical expression of the Apostle to the Corinthians that they are the Temple of God, is nothing to the purpose.

I dare to say that if the Dean had gone no farther, all had been without exception. But he does, and urges a personal union by saying that without it, the body of Christ had been no more then a Figurative Temple, as the other was; that is, the Figure of a

Figure

Figure which is unſufferable. This will not prove a contriving of Types and Figures, of cold and groundleſs Allegories, as they call it, if they are pleas'd but to conſider from all the Texts examin'd before, that God had promis'd to appear, and that all theſe promiſes imply a perſonal appearance. If this can be prov'd, as I humbly conceive that it has, where lyes the difference between a perſonal appearance, and a perſonal union? Can God appear in our nature without taking our nature? Can God be ſeen as a Man without being made Fleſh.

The application of Joh. 1. 14. a dreadful Text to theſe Gentlemen, is not all anſwer'd. The *Dean* ſays, that even the very word ἐσκήνωσεν ἐν ἡμῖν, He *Tabernacl'd* amongſt us, fullfill'd that Type of God's dwelling in the Tabernacle, or Temple in *Jeruſalem* by his dwelling perſonally in our humane nature. They run here to their *Crambe recocta*, their wild explication of that place, of which we ſhall ſee the poverty hereafter.

The *Dean* having ſaid, "that the lamb ſlain from the foundation of the world could not be underſtood "of God's decree, the ordinary evaſion of theſe "Gentlemen, ... But that it was ſlain in Types "and Figures ever ſince the fall of *Adam* in thoſe early "ſacrifices offer'd after the fall, which were Typical "and Figurative of the ſacrifice of *Chriſt*. They cannot deny the matter of fact. But maintain pag. 48. that they were of humane inſtitution and no Types or Figures of the ſacrifice of *Chriſt*. The reaſon, they ſay, is that the ſcripture is ſilent about it. Such a reaſon from ſuch Men is ſurpriſing, who know that the Religion of the firſt Men being all traditional, no account could be given in ſcripture of any poſitive Precept. But that thoſe ſacrifices were no Figures of the ſacrifice of Chriſt, is very ſtrange, if it be granted, that there is no redemption but by *Chriſt*:

that

That no ſin is forgiven but by the vertue of the ſacrifice of *Chriſt* on the Croſs: That all men have ſinned, and come ſhort of the Glory of God: That as it is natural to men to adore the Majeſty of God, it is alſo natural to implore of him pardon of Sin, That both theſe were the deſign of Sacrificing in the firſt Men, and conſequently, that as their Sacrifices were of no validity, but in reſpect of the great Sacrifice offer'd by the Son of God; ſo they muſt of themſelves have been Typical and Figurative.

The *Dean* has ſaid that which is the Doctrine of the Fathers and generally of all Chriſtians. His notion is true and genuine, and thoſe Gentlemen have not anſwer'd it. He asks again, what account can be given of the Jewiſh Prieſthood and Sacrifices which is becoming God, if God is propitiated by a Man ſubject to the ſame Sins and Infirmites? The difficulty is ſolid. For the High Prieſt of the old diſpenſation being a meer Man, He was a Metaphorical Prieſt. He muſt be then the figure of a Prieſthood, and of a Prieſt more perfect; and if the High Prieſt of the new diſpenſation was no more than a Man, for this theſe Gentlemen ſuppoſe notwithſtanding the great addition of Grace and Glory made to him, This High Prieſt is ſtill Metaphorical and Typical, as well as the other. This contradicts the Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, c. 7. v. 2. and foll. *The law made Men Prieſts which had Infirmities, and offer'd daily for their own ſins and then for the people's. But Chriſt our High Prieſt was holy, undefil'd, ſeparate from ſinners and made Higher than the Heavens.* That is, above any created being. *He is able to ſave to the uttermoſt them that come to God by him.* Nothing that is a meer Man is able to ſave. Nothing that is a meer Man is without Infirmities, the very notion of a Creature implying deficiency and want. Therefore if he is no more, he is ſtill Typical and Figurative. This objection is not,

nor

nor can be answer'd with all the turns of Wit and Eloquence in the World. The union of the two natures in that one adorable Person answers it presently and wholly. They are not willing to come up to this: But yet this truth is so clear, and the Argument so pressing that it has extorted from them in the same place, *that God has made Christ as it were God by his unspeakable gifts.* What is all this? what? has he made him half a God, or three parts God, or nine parts in ten God? If Christ is no more then a meer Man, how is he made *as it were God*? If he is God, How is he made *as it were God*? Is this jargon or gibbrish? I understand how a man can be made as it were a King and yet be no King. I apprehend how *Moses* could be a God to *Pharo* by working in him with his wonders an awful sence of him from whom he spoke: But how a man can save his fellow creatures to the uttermost, a meer man satisfy for the sins of mankind, *be made as it were a God*, and yet be no God: do those things which none but God can do, and are the inseparable properties of his Divine nature, and yet be no God, is to me wholly incomprehensible. Let these Gentlemen, who are so strangely afraid of an imaginary Idolatry, have a care lest they lead their few followers into a real one. I leave this to your serious considerarion and remain,

SIR,

Your Humble and faithful
Servant. *L.*

THE

THE Second LETTER.

SIR,

IF the Old Testament seems expres in the assertion of the Divinity of *Jesus Christ*, and if the Prophets have shew'd that the expected *Messias* was God; It must be expected that the New is positive in it, and that the Evangelists and Apostles clearly deliver that great truth. I hope that you will be made sensible of it, and that the answers of your Friends will appear as unsatisfactory to the Texts of the one, as I humbly conceive they are to those of the other.

I ever thought that if this Doctrine is not fully expres't there, we must not think any more to see with our Eyes, or to hear with our Ears. All must be resolv'd into a monstruous uncertainty, and we have no ground left where to rest if this is not firm and solid. That these Gentlemen should be so Zealous against it, and agreeing with us in the truth of the holy Scriptures should use so much learning and industry not to see that which is so visible, is to me no small cause of admiration. We must in this adore the judgments of God and pray to him that he would give them Grace to employ their excellent parts to a better use, and do as much for the truth, as they have done against it.

They have been led to this by the presumptious assertion of some in the Roman communion, and in particular by *Dyonisius Petavius*, a better Chronologist than

than a Divine, who to raiſe not ſo much Tradition, as theſe Gentlemen miſtake him, as the power of the Church in deciding Controverſies, have thought that our myſteries could not be prov'd by the plain authority of Scripture. If this is true, the Primitive Chriſtians could give no account of their Faith before the determination of Councels; and were left unarm'd, and without defence againſt the inſults of Hereticks: which is unreaſonable to the higheſt degree, and a thought unworthy of that Providence which makes the Church its peculiar care.

No, Sir, The Scripture ought to be our rule: Nor can we better judge of God, or of the things of God, than by the diſcovery which he has made of himſelf in his word. To this we are willing to ſtand without doubting either of the ſucceſs, or goodneſs of the cauſe. But before we come to particular places, I muſt lay before you ſome grievances, which if not redres'ſt, it is impoſſible to treat this ſacred matter with candor. I hope none of us diſpute for diſputing ſake. It is as much in controverſies as in any other thing that we ſhall be brought to an account for every idle word.

1*ſt*. There is an injuſtice in theſe Gentlemen who pretend to add much to their Interpretations by ſheltering them under the name of ſome learned Proteſtant; and make uſe of this againſt us. But will not take what they give and except againſt all the Authorities alledg'd againſt them.

2*ly*. In the lett. of reſolut. concerning the Doctr. of the Trin. and Incarn. *pag*. 3. I demand, ſays the Author, ſuch a Text of our appoſers, and do here profeſs that if they name it not, t'is becauſe they cannot. He had ſaid before, "That that Text cannot "be nam'd which ſome or other of the learn'd Pro"teſtants have not either interpreted, as t'is inter"preted by *Socinians*, or *Arrians*; or expreſsly ſaid "t'was

"'twas not intended by the inſpir'd Author concern-
"ing the Incarnation, or Trinity, or any Perſon therein. He grows dogmatical upon this and adds;
"I will leave it with you, Sir, whether this be not
"a juſt exception to theſe Doctrines: even this that
"they have no ſufficient foundation in Scripture by
"the confeſſion of the learn'dſt of our oppoſers?
How many exceptions is that ſort of reaſoning liable to? How can theſe Gentlemen take for themſelves what is ſaid for the *Arrians*, whoſe principles are ſo different, whoſe ſyſtem is ſo inconſiſtent with theirs? How boundleſs is ſuch an aſſertion which without naming any particulars, extends firſt to all and then to moſt of the learned Proteſtants? Theſe Texts, or thoſe Interpreters are not ſo many, but a ſhort Catalogue might have been given. Admitting the thing to be true; How comes it that none of thoſe learned Proteſtants are turn'd *Socinians*, particularly having given up all their places of ſtrength? Is there any argument for any Doctrine either in Philoſophy or Divinity but what has met with ſome Eminent oppoſer? And what wiſe Man will conclude that nothing is true or certain, becauſe ſome learned Perſon or other, has given up, ſome one, and ſome other, that part of the Argument which he thought did not prove the thing in queſtion? Who is inſenſible, particularly the ſtudious, that many learned Men have been ſingular in the interpretation of ſome places of Scripture for want of attention, or piety, which I take to be moſt neceſſary in an Interpreter, or to make ſhew of a ſplendid erudition, or becauſe they thought the thing treated of had more ſubſtantial arguments, or becauſe they had eſpous'd a new ſyſtem, which laſt caſe I take to be that of *Grotius*, and of theſe very Gentlemen. Had this Author ſaid that any one, or the ſeveral bodies of Proteſtants had given up every particular Text, it would have been of ſome force: But the reaſoning,

as

as it lyes, is a Rodomontado, a miſtake, and a fallacy.

3*ly*. I complain that theſe Gentlemen are angry with all the tranſlations of the Bible. *pag*. 25. of the anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn*." If the Heavenly words were "but honeſtly tranſlated the *Socinians* would not fear "any inference from them. Our Proteſtant oppoſers "value themſelves much on this account, that they "have given to the people the holy Bible in vulgar "languages. It may however be ſaid that they have "been more crafty then the Papiſts in impoſing upon "the people ..... The Papiſts have ſillily rais'd a "clamor by witholding the Bible from the people "..... The Proteſtants have been wiſer, though not "a bit more ſincere .... They have Printed all the Bi-"bles that are in the original Greek Tongue from ſuch "Manuſcript Copies as have been corrected to ſpeak "the language of the Church, and from Bibles ſo cor-"rected and Printed they have made their tranſlations. "Nor has the fraud ſtop't there; For wherever there "is an ambiguity in the Original Hebrew, or Greek, "they have always ſo tranſlated as to confirm their "own Doctrines.

A caſe is very deſperate when it ſhelters it ſelf under ſuch aſperſions. Had theſe Gentlemen charg'd our Reformers with inadvertency or want of erudition it had been more tolerable. But to lay at their doors unſincerity and craft is bold and odious. Their great Piety and their Zeal for the cauſe of God for which many of them dy'd, is inconſiſtent with this. The plain Engliſh is this; Give up all your Bibles, and truſt to our Interpretation.

I have no time to run through all the Tranſlations of the Bible, to vindicate the care and application taken to make them perfectly agreeable to the original. A ſpecimen of ours is to be found in the Appendix to the Hiſtory of the Reformation by My Lord of *Sarum* whom

whom theſe Gentlemen have ſtil'd *the Euſebius of this age.* It is impoſſible but ſome minute things will eſcape the moſt exact diligence. But as to the main, they have been made after the ancienteſt Copies extant; and of all thoſe which I underſtand, none is ſo admirable and ſo full of various readings as the Engliſh.

How is it poſſible ever to come to a concluſion with Perſons of this Temper? I produce a Text for the Divinity of *Jeſus Chriſt.* They pretend another reading. Who muſt be our judge? I maintain the tranſlation to be agreeable to the original. It is not deny'd. But another reading, and another ſence is pretended alſo agreeable to the Original. Which of theſe two muſt carry it? Either mine which is according to all the readings, all the Tranſlators, and all the Interpreters; or this new and as yet unknown ſence? This is the caſe between us, and of this I complain, that theſe Gentlemen think to have anſwer'd an objection, when to a place generally and anciently read and underſtood as it is propos'd, they ſubſtitute a new and unknown interpretation.

I ſay that no interpretation is to be receiv'd which is new: That to anſwer is not to have the laſt word, and offer ſome glimmering light to a difficulty; That the candor of a ſerious diſpute admits of no ſuch thing; and that that ſence muſt take place which is moſt eaſy, moſt ancient and moſt univerſal.

4*ly.* I am griev'd to ſee the Tradition of the Church in that point ſo ridicul'd by theſe Gentlemen, and the Nicene Council, the firſt general meeting of the Fathers, and reverenc't by all the after ages call'd the *Homoouſian faction*, in the mock Hiſtory of the acts of the great *Athanaſius.* I muſt give it that name, it being impoſſible that Men who are vers't in Eccleſiaſtical learning ſhould have writ it ſeriouſly: There being ſcarce in it any one matter of fact true and genuine.

If

if I may be allow'd a digreſſion; I would willingly know where theſe Gentlemen found that *Conſtantine* dy'd an Unitarian? If by an Unitarian they mean that he own'd the Unity of the Godhead, I hope we ſhall all dye in that faith. But if by it they mean a Socinian, a denyer of the Divinity of Chriſt, It is a groſs and a palpable untruth. I would alſo be ſatisfi'd whether *Euſebius* of *Cæſarea* whom they ſo truly call'd the Admirable did not ſubſcribe the Nicene faith.

To return. In an anſwer to a loving Coſen *pag.* 3. "We hear of nothing but Fathers, Tradition, Coun-"cils, *&c. pag.* 8. This general Obſervation concern-"ing the Fathers is ſufficient to make me refuſe their "teſtimony, and look upon them *as no good Interpre-"ters of Scripture, and unfaithfull Guardians of Traditi-"on.*

We are then in a very ſad caſe. Our Tranſlations are diſhoneſt, and the Holy Fathers are no good Interpreters of Scripture, and unfaithfull Guardians of Tradition. Our Tranſlations and the Fathers ſhould have ſpoke as theſe Gentlemen, and then all had been right. Where will of neceſſity ſuch wild notions lead Men, and when will the diſpute end if they are admitted?

For my part I am of Mr. *Chillingworth's* mind, and think that it is both the ſafety and honour of the Proteſtant Religion to cry out, *The Bible, The Bible*, a place of that eminent Man ſo often and ſo juſtly commended by theſe Gentlemen. I am perſwaded that the word of God ought to be the rule. But then I am ſatisfi'd, that no Scripture is of private interpretation: That this Bible muſt be well underſtood: and that Tradition is the greateſt human Authority in the World. I take this point to be ſo clear, particularly to Men of learning, that if any Society of Chriſtians could produce for what they have to ſay for themſelves ſuch a Tradition as *Vincentius Lirinenſis*

nensis has eſtabliſht, and is the true notion of Tradition, we muſt all come over to it.

This is ſo juſt in it ſelf, that theſe very Gentlemen cannot forbear expreſſing their joy, when what they produce is not altogether their own, and has ſome great names to introduce it. They ſpeak then with a certain ſort of aſſurance, which they have not at other times.

I do not know whether I am as other Men, or whether it is a ſingularity in me; but if I have never ſo pretty a notion and find it contradicted by the concurrent teſtimonies of Men who have united a profound Piety, to an admirable Learning; ſuch as are the *Baſil*'s, The *Chryſoſtom*'s, The *Theodoret*'s, The two *Gregorie*'s, The *Euſebius*'s, The *Cyrill*'s, The *Jerom*'s, The *Auſtin*'s, and many more: If I find primitive and General Councils exclaiming againſt me: If I meet in my way almoſt all that has been valuable in the laſt, and this preſent Age in the Common-wealth of learning: Though I might perhaps maintain the notion and ſpin it into a Letter or a ſmall Book, not perhaps without ſome Admirers; yet I preſently ſtrike, and think it both moſt honourable and conſcientious to call the pretty thing in.

5*ly*. I have a juſt value for Criticks; though whether a Critick is Maſter of any one ſort of Learning is a great Queſtion to me. But to make Criticks the Judges, and Criticiſms the Touchſtone of Faith is inſufferable. Like Anatomiſts they diſſect, till they leave neither Form nor Figure. A Criticiſm is much different from a good reaſon: Allowing one to be good, a hundred amount generally to no more than a probability. They are a ſort of Arrows ſhot at random, which ſometimes hit the mark, and generally go above, or below it. I inſiſt the more on this, becauſe it is the *Palladium* of theſe Gentlemen. When a Text is plain and ſtares in the face, then comes out the

the Criticiſm. This is the diſſecting Inſtrument which runs through the Text till wrangling ariſes about a Particle, or a Punctuation, and makes the ſubſtantial part of the diſpute to vaniſh. When Reaſon is oppos'd to Reaſon, and Argument to Argument, the ſtander by may, in a very ſhort time, feel the impreſſions of truth. But when a plain Authority is evaded by a Criticiſm, and this Criticiſm perhaps anſwer'd by another, For theſe Gentlemen are great but not the only Criticks, There is jarring and claſhing, and not one ſtep made towards the truth.

In the Letter of Reſolut. concern. the Doctr. of the Trin. and Incar. *p.* 10. the Author ſays, and he is very much in the right, that we pretend, "That the Tri-"nity and Incarnation are Traditions deriv'd down to "our times through all the intermediate Ages, and by "all the Churches profeſſing Chriſtianity. The rational way to prove the vanity of the pretence is to ſhew that there was a time and ſome Church or other where theſe Doctrines were not believ'd. Inſtead of this he ſpends three pages to prove how we have differ'd, and do differ amongſt our ſelves in the explication of theſe Doctrines; which rather ſupports then weakens the Argument. It does evince; that we agree in the thing though not in the manner of explaining it, which is that that I inſiſt on, with the reſt of my Brethren the *Divines of the mob*, as theſe Gentlemen call us.

But this is only to criticiſe at large. "All the "Criticks, ſays this ſame Author in the ſame Letter, "*without excepting one*, who have made a judgment of "the writings of the Fathers for the firſt 300 Years, "and particularly which of thoſe writings are genuine "and uncorrupted, which wholly feign'd or otherwiſe "corrupted, I ſay, *All the Criticks* conſtantly make "this a Note of forgery, or corruption, if thoſe "writings ſpeak any what expreſsly or evidently of "theſe Doctrines.

If the Criticks mean that the writings of the Primitive Fathers, which ſpeak of thoſe Myſteries in the Terms us'd by the Schools long ſince the Nicene Council, are ſuppoſs'd; They are in the right: But this Criticiſm is againſt thoſe Gentlemen themſelves. It regards only the manner of the expreſſion, not the thing expreſs'd. But if the Criticks mean that the Trinity, or Incarnation were unknown to, and were not the Doctrine of the Fathers before the Council of *Nice*, which is that which theſe Gentlemen muſt make the Criticks to ſay, or elſe they ſay nothing: I beg leave of theſe Gentlemen, *and of all the Criticks, not one excepted*, to tell them that they are invincibly miſtaken. I have no criticiſm to offer here, nor will I fill this ſmall writing with citations of theſe Fathers, it being the thing in queſtion; Though I conceive, with ſubmiſſion to the high and mighty Criticks, that moſt of theſe citations may be prov'd genuine. I have only two plain Reaſons to offer. 1*ſt*. With what equity and aſſurance did the Nicene Fathers declare their decrees to be according to the Doctrine taught by the Fathers who had preceeded them, if the *Trinity* and *Incarnation* was not the Doctrine of thoſe Fathers? The Council was an Auguſt Meeting of the moſt learned and Religious Perſons in the World, even by the confeſſion of their Adverſaries. Some of them had preſerv'd the gift of miracles which expir'd ſoon after. Such an aſſertion, had it not been true, would have better become a pack of Villains, than Holy and Reverend Men. 2*ly*, How durſt the Nicence Fathers declare this to be the Faith, and Anathematiſe whoſoever was againſt *that ſacred, wiſe, Divine and Catholick Faith*: had this Faith been new and unknown to the Fathers before, nay, had a contrary Faith obtain'd then in the Chriſtian World? This is a monſtruous ſuppoſition, that within 300 Years after *Chriſt*, the Nicene Fathers ſhould preſume

preſume to obtrude the belief of, and declare a Doctrine to be Faith which the Primitive Fathers were not ſo much as acquainted with. To give more ſtrength to this, and prevent an objection which perhaps may have ſome colour, and occaſion another Criticiſm, I freely own that not only the *Arrians*, but even ſome of the Orthodox complain'd, that the words *Conſubſtantial*, and *Conſubſtantiality*, were new and unſcriptural. But this confirms what I have ſaid; the newneſs and unſcripturalneſs of the words, but not of the ſence being aſſerted. They agreed in the truth and antiquity of the Doctrine, but only differ'd about theſe two words, which by being new and unſcriptural were not thought ſo fit to expreſs it. I beg your pardon for inſiſting ſo long upon this. But I was forc't to it; 1*ſt*, Becauſe this very place of that Letter you have often urg'd to me. 2*ly*, To ſhew that how great Criticks ſoever we are, we muſt be juſt and equitable, and value reaſons above Criticiſms. If theſe Gentlemen write for the Unlearned, they are much out of the way; theſe things are above their reach: And if for the Learned, they muſt own that this has not made one Learned Man of their ſide. It is a ſort of *Chicane* which Men of ſence abhor.

6*ly*, Theſe Gentlemen would have us prove thoſe Terms by Scriptures which we own to be unſcriptural. They challenge us to find in the New Teſtament the word *Godman*, *Trinity*, *Incarnation*; nay, whole Propoſitions in *Terminis*. The Author of the Letter now cited, *pag.* 10. pretends it as a great Argument of their ſide, that *Tertullian* is the firſt amongſt the *Latins*, and *Clemens Alexand.* amongſt the *Greeks*, who firſt us'd the word *Trinity*. We might as well aſk, and with as little reaſon, where is the word *Unity* in reſpect of God, or *Sacrament* or *Hierarchy*, and ſeveral more, which all the World receives, and yet are no Scriptural words? If we do but find the things ex-

preſt by the words, as that God is one, that there is Baptiſm, and the Lord's Supper, that there is an order of Men appointed to adminiſter holy things, the words are a natural conſequence, and founded in the things themſelves. Is it not highly unjuſt to ask us where we find a *Trinity*, if we can prove three Divine Perſons; That beſides the Father whom they acknowledge to be God, the Son alſo, and the Holy Spirit is God? To wonder at the word, *Eternal Generation*; ſince if we prove *Chriſt*'s Pre-exiſtence and Pre-eternity, He cannot be the Son of God but by way of Eternal Generation. To ſtare at the word, *Incarnation*, as ſuch an unheard of thing, ſince if *Chriſt* is God, and yet has taken our nature, He muſt be Incarnate. Theſe are poor, mean, and a ſort of Mob difficulties.

Theſe Grievances being conſider'd I beg nothing but what is equitable. 1*ſt*, I beg that if we prove the thing in queſtion, that is, the Divinity of *Chriſt*, and of the Holy Spirit, we may have no quarell about the words *Trinity* and *Incarnation*.

2*ly*, That no particular Interpretation of any Proteſtant Author may be brought againſt us as Interpretation either of our Church or any other conſiderable body of Proteſtants.

3*ly*, That if a Text is capable of a various reading, and of a double ſence, that ſence and reading may be preſerv'd, which is prov'd to have been the ancient reading, and the ſence generally receiv'd in the Churches of God. A ſence new and unknown to all the Ages of the Church cannot be the ſence: and that poſſeſſion which we and all Chriſtian Societies are in of thoſe Texts, cannot be diſturb'd, without ſomething more forcible and authoritative than the witty fancy of an Interpreter.

4*ly*, I beg that the Fathers may be heard as Witneſſes of an unqueſtionable integrity; and that this

at

at leaſt may be a real prejudice againſt theſe Gentlemen, that they have not only oppos'd the Faith of their Age, but alſo that of times paſt.

5*ly*, That a Criticiſm alone, the doubting of a Book, the denying of a place, the wrangling about a Particle, without ſome conſiderable reaſon to back it, may not be look't upon as an Anſwer.

6*ly*, That not only ſome one particular Text which we alledge be conſider'd; but that all our Texts be taken together with the weight of the important reaſons which inforce the belief of our Myſteries. This granted, I conceive that it is no difficult matter to convince a candid Oppoſer, that the New Teſtament is clear for the Divinity of Chriſt.

We will begin by that which is the foundation of our Holy Religion. *Matt.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore, and teach all nations baptiſing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.* This is the ancient profeſſion of our Faith, and ingenuouſly acknowledg'd to be ſuch, by the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milb. pag.* 16. He cites for this *Tertullian de bapt. c.* 13. He might have cited *Theodoret lib.* 1. *c.* 12. St. *Baſil de Spir. ſanct.* and *Arrius* himſelf, who is a Witneſs of this in the Confeſſion of his Faith, given to *Conſtantine*, and reported by *Socrates lib.* 1. *c.* 26.

The Orthodox from this Text conclude three Perſons to be ſpoken of. Theſe Gentlemen only two; The Father who is God, and the Son. The Holy Ghoſt they will have to be no more than the Energy of the Father. They are poſitive in the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 25. That neither the more learned of their Oppoſers, nor the Fathers of the firſt 400 Years, inſiſt on this Text to prove the Divinity of the Lord Chriſt, and of the Holy Spirit. The matter of fact is a vaſt miſtake, and the very ſuppoſition is impoſſible; This place having been cited ſo often by the Ancients and modern to prove the Perſons of the

Trinity, muſt of courſe in their Hypotheſis, be an Argument for their Divinity.

They agree with us, that the Son ſpoken of in the Text is *Chriſt Jeſus*, whom they will have to be the Son of God, by all other titles but that of *Nature*, and *Eſſence*. They ſay of him that he is the Son of God by his miraculous Conception in the womb of the Bleſſed Virgin; By his Miſſion to preach to Men, and reclaim them from their Sins; by his Glorious Reſurrection, being begotten to a new Life, and his Admiſſion to a Bleſſed Immortality, whence, as God's deputy, he is to come to judge the quick and the dead: But that for all this he is a Man, and no more than a Man, he has no other Exiſtence, no other Nature. We on the contrary, beſides all theſe titles, inſiſt on that of *Nature*. We ſay that he is the Son of God after a manner incommunicable to any Created Being.

I ſuppoſe that if the *Pre-exiſtence*, and *Pre-eternity* of the Son can be prov'd, his *Equality* with the Father, his *ſameneſs* of Nature, and a communication of thoſe names, by which the only true God is known to us, the aſſertion will be juſtifi'd. For all that we conceive of God, being that he exiſts before all things, that he has neither beginning, nor ending, that he is above all things, that he is infinite in perfections; That he is the Creator, and in a moſt eminent way the Lord of all that is; If this is made out of the Son, in vain thoſe Gentlemen ſtruggle to reduce what is ſaid of him, to their poor wayes of explaining how he is the Son of God; ſince none of their explications can amount to any part of this.

1*ſt*, Then to prove his pre-exiſtence, that is, that he had a being before he was conceiv'd of the Virgin, read *Joh.* 6. 62. *What and if you ſhall ſee the Son of Man aſcend up where he was before?* The deſign of the whole Chapter is to convince the Jews that they ought to receive him. The Argument he uſes is that *he is*

come

come down from Heaven. He tells them that he is the food of their Souls. That their Fathers indeed had meat ſent from above, but that it could not keep them from Death; But that he brings them bread of ſo great a vertue that it would procure immortality: That this bread is his Fleſh which he gives for the life of the World. His hearers were ſcandalis'd at this. The diſcontent affected even his Diſciples: Till *Jeſus* to convince them that he came from Heaven, tells them poſitively that he was there before, and that as a proof of this they ſhould ſee him aſcending thither again. There is not, nor can be a more eaſy way of Arguing. You doubt whether I come from Heaven to feed and preſerve, to ſave and redeem you. What greater proof of this can you deſire then to ſee me aſcend to Heaven, where I was before, and from whence I deſcended? If Chriſt then was actually in Heaven before he was born, theſe two truths cannot be deny'd. *1ſt.* that he had another Nature beſides the human, ſince he had another exiſtence. *2ly*, That he muſt have exiſted, before the time aſſign'd by theſe Gentlemen, to be the firſt of his Exiſtence, that is, his Conception in the Virgin. If Chriſt was not before he was born; how can he ſay that he was in Heaven? If Chriſt was not in Heaven, how does he offer them to let them ſee him aſcending thither again?

The Apoſtle takes this for granted, *Eph.* 4. 9. He proves by Chriſt's aſcending to Heaven, that he deſcended from thence. Whether he alludes or no to this place is uncertain. But he looks upon Chriſt being come down from Heaven, and having been actually there, as a principle agreed on by all Men. *How that he aſcended, what is it, but he alſo deſcended firſt?* and *v.* 10. *He that deſcended is the ſame alſo that aſcended far above all Heavens*, &c. He then who aſcended from us to Heaven, did firſt deſcend from Heaven to us. *Joh.* 6. 33. *The bread of God is he which comes*

comes down from Heaven. Joh. 3. 31. *He that comes from above is above all... He that comes from Heaven is above all.* Joh. 16. 27. *I came forth from the Father, and am come into the World; again I leave the World, and go to the Father.*

This Doctrine is not only of the Scripture; but it may be said to be one of the first notices of Christianity, there being scarce any Sect or denomination of Christians, but believes that Heaven is the place from whence their Redeemer is come. A notion so plain, so easy, so consistent with the whole revelation of the will of God, that *Photinus* Bishop of *Syrmium*, the *Socinus* of his Age, was not only condemn'd by several Councils, but Anathematis'd also by the several perswasions of Christians, and even by the *Arrians* and *Semi-Arrians*, themselves.

What these Gentlemen, oppose consists in this. The Author of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn* says, *pag.* 25. "That Christ was actually taken up into "Heaven, and took his instructions from the Father "before he enter'd upon his Prophetical Office. "That this is intimated by the very place which we "have examin'd, by *Joh.* 8. 38. but particularly by "*Joh.* 3. 13. *No Man has ascended to Heaven, but he* "*that is come down from Heaven, even the Son of Man,* "*who is in Heaven*; That the word, *is*, must be read, "*was*, that *Erasmus*, *Beza*, *Camerarius*, read it thus; "That the Evangelists have not spoke of the time of "this assumption because it was before their being "call'd to be his Disciples; that *Christ* never told "them of it, but only *hinted it* in some discourses. The Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 27. 28. Cites the same Authors for the word *was*. He tells us. "That "the most Orthodox Interpreters understand it me-"taphorically. But that the *Socinians* understand "this Text litterally, and say that 'tis here intimated, "that before our Lord enter'd upon his Office of "*Messias*, He was taken up to Heaven to be instructed

in

" in the mind and will of God, as *Moſes* was into " the mount. *Exod.* 24. 1. and foll. and from thence " deſcended to execute his Office: That the ſame thing " is alſo hinted. *Joh.* 6. 38. *Joh.* 8. 40.

When I ſee ſuch anſwers to a place of that importance, ſo expreſs and ſo poſitive, and from Perſons of ſo much Learning, I ask my ſelf whether I dream, or am really awake? I am tempted to loſe all the reſpect which I have for them, and begin to think that it is not reaſon and conſcience, but obſtinacy which makes *Socinians*. *1ſt*, The Authors before cited do not ſay that it ought to be read *was*, but that it may be read thus. *Qui eſt in cœlo*, ſays *Beza*, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, *vel qui erat in cœlo. Beza* in *Joh.* 3. 13. Theſe great Criticks are not ſenſible that the, *was*, is as much for us as the, *is*. I hope they have read the advice of this Learned Man in the notes on this very Verſe. Having diſcourſt of the Union of the two natures in *Chriſt*, He concludes in theſe words. *I thought fit to make theſe ſhort remarks againſt a ſort of Men, who are not aſham'd in this our Age, to fetch back from Hell the deteſtable errors of* Neſtorius *and* Eutyches, *oppos'd by the vaſt labours and ſtudies of all the Fathers, and condemn'd with the clear and unanimous conſent of the whole Church.*

2ly, I deny that the moſt learned Interpreters have underſtood it in a Metaphorical ſence. This is another of thoſe Gentlemen's boundleſs citations. A Metaphorical ſence of theſe words is ridiculous, impertinent and inconſiſtent with the thing it ſelf. They ſee it, and therefore they forſake the allegory, and come to the matter of fact, that *Chriſt* was actually in Heaven before he came to preach the Goſpel.

You ſee what it is to eſpouſe a wrong notion. They are reſolv'd upon aſſerting that *Chriſt* had no being before he he was conceiv'd in the Bleſſed Virgin. The objection made to them is ſo plain that they can by no means

means evade or deny it. But yet rather than submit, they run themselves into a groundless, I must beg their pardon, If I say, a senceless supposition of our Saviour being taken up to Heaven about the 30th Year of his Age. 1*st*, There is not one word of it in the writings of either the Evangelists, or Apostles. 2*ly*, There is not so much as a Father, or an Ecclesiastical Writer ever made that conjecture; no not *Hebion* the Jew, not *Marcellus* of *Ancyra*, nor *Theodore* of *Mopsweſt*, not *Photinus* himself. 3*ly*, There never was any Ascension of Christ into Heaven taught or believ'd in the Church, but that which follow'd the Resurrection; nor no other coming from thence, but when he took our Flesh, and when he will come to judge the World. 4*ly*, I appeal to any one who will judge equitably of things, whether it is probable that the Evangelists who have descended to so many minute and particular actions of *Jesus Christ*, would ever have omitted a circumstance of so mighty a weight as this; of so great a necessity; and a glorious introduction to all the rest? No, say these Gentlemen, but they did not know it: This was done before he had call'd them to be his Apostles. Oh strange! was not the adoration of the wise Men, His sitting in the midst of the Doctors, His being Baptis'd of *John*, His prodigious Fast, His Temptation in the Wilderness and so many other parts of His Life before his calling them to that Office? How came they to know all this and not this imaginary Ascension, found out sixteen hundred Years after the preaching of the Gospel? "But "though *Christ* did say nothing to them of it, *yet he* "*hinted it.* I deny that he did. His coming from Heaven had no relation but to his being there before his assuming our nature. But supposing that he did, which is false, For if these Gentlemen cannot prove a thing, they will endeavour *to hint it*, I ask of them, whether Religion can be built upon *a Hint*, and what account

account we can give of the Hope which is in us, if it is resolv'd into *Hints*.

This Pre-existence of *Christ* is fully prov'd from *Joh.* 8. 56. and foll. *v.* He tells the Jews that *Abraham* rejoiced to see his day, that he saw it and was glad. They presently come to the, *How can it be? Abraham* himself being dead so many hundred Years before, and himself not yet fifty Years Old? *Jesus* answers that for all that it was as he said. He assures it with a repeated asseveration, *Verily, Verily, I say to you, before Abraham was I am*; or as the Syriack and other Translations read, *I was*. If *Christ Jesus* had no other existence but from the Virgin *Mary*, How comes he to say that he was before *Abraham*? He could not be before *Abraham*, as he was the Son of *Mary*. He could not exist according to the human nature before he was a Man. If he existed then, as he says positively that he did, it must be as he was that God who in the fullness of time was pleas'd to appear to us. Thus Dr. *Hammond*, in his Paraphrase on this place. "You are much mistaken in the reckoning of "my Age, for I have a being from all Eternity, and "so before *Abraham* was born, *&c.* I cite this Reverend Person by reason of an aspersion laid on him by these Gentlemen in a letter to a loving Cosen. *pag.* 14. They make the Doctor to look upon the mystery of the Holy Trinity, *as a thing altogether useless and uncapable of moving the heart of Man. He could not find*, says the Author, *a place in his large practical Catechism for the great spring of the Trinity.*

That the sence given to this Text is true and genuine appears from the behaviour of the Jews at *v.* 59. *Then they took up stones to cast at him.* Had the assertion been capable of a figurative sence, it would never have mov'd them to such a degree. They certainly understood him of a real and actual existence. Their objection, *thou art not yet fifty Years Old*, was of that natural

Age

Age which they thought *Christ* had not yet attain'd. They took the answer to be litteral, and therefore judging the thing to be blasphemous and impossible, they would have ston'd him. And that the answer was litteral is undenyable. Notwithstanding my Years, says *Christ*, I have seen *Abraham*. This were indeed impossible to see him who has been dead above 1800 Years, if I had no other being but what you see: It would be Blasphemous if I were no more then a Man born in time, to take that upon me which belongs only to God, and to call the things that are not, as though they were; But I tell you that I was before *Abraham*. I had a being of my own, and I did actually exist before he was born. I take this to be evident and concluſive.

This Text is one of those dangerous places which are like to overthrow the *Socinian* Fabrick, and therefore these Gentlemen do all that they can to elude its force. They have been so judicious as to forsake the ruinous and impertinent answers of *Cbrellius*, and their other outlandish Friends, and have reduc't themselves to this. The Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 29. allows the reading, *I was*. *Grotius* owns it, and therefore it could not be handsomely deny'd. To the rest he says, 1*st*, "That *Abraham* saw *Christ*'s day in the "spirit of Prophecy. He saw it not as coming, but "as present; He foresaw, as he desir'd, the time when "it should be. 2*ly*, That Christ is here said to be "before *Abraham* not actually, but in the councel, "decree, and ordination of God. And that St. *Au-*"*stin* has confes's'd it; He cites for this. 1 Pet. 1. 20. *The lamb slain from the foundation of the World*, and Rev. 13. 8. *The lamb slain from the foundation of the World*. He adds, "That the Jews did not apprehend in "what sence *Christ* spoke. But neither did he intend "or care they should .... They being averse from "Truth and Piety, he often so spake to some of them, "as to perplex and affront their blindness .... and

"not

" not to inſtruct them. He alledges for this *Luk.*8.10.

The 1*ſt* Part of the Anſwer is to no purpoſe. Who doubts but that Abraham ſaw *Chriſt* in the ſpirit of Prophecy? The queſtion is not, how *Abraham* did ſee his day and rejoiced, but How he could exiſt before *Abraham? Before Abraham was, I was.* I had a being before *Abraham* was born. That's the point to be inſiſted on.

The 2*d* Part, that *Chriſt* was before *Abraham* in God's decree and ordination is alſo to no purpoſe. The queſtion is whether *Chriſt* has ſeen *Abraham*? The Jews ſay thou haſt not, for thou art not yet fifty Years Old; Thou art much poſterior to him. But I tell you, ſays *Chriſt*, I am ſo far from being poſterior, that I am anterior to him; Before he was I am. Now we muſt judge of the anſwer by the queſtion. The one ought to have relation to the other; or elſe it is all croſs purpoſes, which muſt not ſo much as be thought of here. To deal candidly; do the Jews ask *Chriſt*, whether he is ſo much later then *Abraham* in time or only in the decree of God? It is certainly in time; Thou art not yet fifty Years Old. Therefore *Chriſt* ſpeaks alſo of a priority of time, and not of decree: Before he was I am.

Beſides admitting of that decree, *Chriſt* could not have ſaid that he was in the decree before *Abraham*. For *Abraham* in whoſe ſeed all nations were to be bleſſed, was in the decree before the ſeed it ſelf. *Abraham's* coming into the World was in the decree before *Chriſt's* appearing in the Fleſh.

This Author has cited St. *Auſtin*, but neither his words nor the place where they are to be found. If he means in his tracts on the Goſpel of St. *John*, He will find that he has made uſe of this Text to confirm an Hypotheſis which runs through all his writings; that God having decreed to ſave Mankind in the Mediator *Jeſus*, He is the firſt of the Elect, the firſt of the decree,

cree, and in that ſence conſequently before *Abraham*, and all Men beſides; but this ſtill upon the ſuppoſition of the Union of the two Natures in his Perſon, which if theſe Gentlemen had obſerv'd, they durſt not ſo much as have nam'd him, nothing in the World overthrowing their Doctrine ſo effectually as this. The 1. *Pet.* 1. 20. and *Rev.* 13. 8. are altogether foreign to the queſtion. They regard his Office but not his Perſon; His mediation in the behalf of us Sinners, but not his Nature.

The 3*d* Part of the Anſwer that the Jews did not apprehend *Chriſt*, and that he did not intend, or care they ſhould, is a Propoſition, which, if admitted, ruines the whole Oeconomy of the Goſpel. It makes the God of Incomprehenſible Mercies to be guilty of the moſt refin'd ſort of Cruelty, to proffer the Patient a Medicine which muſt undoubtedly Cure him, and at the ſame time, to make him incapable of taking it. Certainly they cannot but ſee the horrour of ſuch an Anſwer.

Before I leave this Text I muſt take notice of the words of the Author ſpoken of *Abraham*, with ſo much caution, and to ſo little purpoſe. He ſaw it, ſays he, as coming, not as preſent; He foreſaw as he deſir'd the time that it ſhould be. The nature of Prophecy is to make preſent to the ſight of the Prophet that which by being future is wholly out of his reach. It is that which makes it miraculous. But in the caſe of *Abraham* he did not only deſire, but had a clear Revelation of the day of *Chriſt*. He ſaw it, and the ineffable proſpect of the glory of the *Meſſias* and of the Infinite Bleſſings Mankind was to receive by him, fill'd him with an incredible Joy. This is the true ſence of the place.

But what can more ſubſtantially evince the Pre-exiſtence of *Chriſt* before all things, than that all things are created by him? That he has given Being to whatſoever exiſts: That he is not only their Creator

but

but alſo their Preſerver, and that whatſoever exiſts is maintain'd and ſupported by him. What will become of that poor aſſertion which fixes his Exiſtence to the firſt moment of his Conception, if it can be made plain, that he was before any thing that is, and exiſted before any thing did exiſt. For the effect naturally ſuppoſes the Pre-exiſtence of the cauſe. Any work that is done implies the being of the Workman who did it; and if the World is created by *Chriſt*; If the Scripture fully and clearly teaches him to be the Creator of the World, The Socinian foundation muſt be ſandy and ruinous.

The Author of the Epiſtle to the *Hebrews*, 1ſt Chap. v. 2. ſays poſitively, that Chriſt made the World. *He has in theſe laſt dayes ſpoken to us by his Son by whom alſo he made the Worlds, δι' ὃ καὶ τοὺς αἰῶνας ἐποίησεν.* But here we are ſtop't ſhort by the Author of the Brief Hiſt. pag. 41. who tells us, "That "*Grotius*, the irrefragable *Grotius*, ſays, that we "tranſlate ill *by whom*, and that we ſhould read *for* "*whom*: That it was a Maxim amongſt the Jews that "the World was made for the *Meſſias*. If this fails, he tells you that others inſiſt that this is an allegory; that *αἰῶνας* muſt be tranſlated *Ages*, by which are meant the Goſpel Ages or times. Thus ſinking Men graſp at any thing that appears, let it be ſhadow or ſubſtance.

With what confidence can Men ſubſtitute a reading contrary to all the Tranſlations extant, which read *by whom*? *Per quem*, ſays the old latin, the Syriac and all the Fathers. To prove the truth of their Tranſlation, they have an empty notion that it was believ'd amongſt the Jews, that the World was made for the *Meſſias*, which indeed is the opinion of a few late Rabbins, follow'd in this by *Grotius*, who in his interpretation of the Scripture has wholly departed from the ancient Jews. Whereas if theſe Gentlemen de-

ſire it, It will be made out, that it is the conſtant tradition of the Jews, that the World was made *by the word, the Son of God.* This deſtroys the Allegory to all intents and purpoſes; and really it is ſo raw, and ſo dragg'd, that it eaſily deſtroys it ſelf. If there were no place but this for the Creation of the World, or of the Worlds, or of the Ages, for theſe are all one, they might, with more colour, fly from the letter to the Trope. But we may ſay, that there is ſcarce any thing in the Scripture more inculcated than this.

Through Faith, ſays St. *Paul,* Heb. 11. 3. *We underſtand that the Worlds were fram'd by the word of God.* Heb. 1. 8. *But unto the Son he ſays, thy Thorne, O God, is for ever and ever ..... and thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the foundation of the earth, and the Heavens are the work of thy hands: They ſhall periſh, but thou remaineſt: and they ſhall wax old as does a garment, and as a veſture ſhall thou fold them up, and they ſhall be chang'd, but thou art the ſame, and thy Years ſhall not fail.* There is then 1*ſt*, A general aſſertion of the Apoſtle. *We believe* that all that is, has been made by the word; and this, as a true Creator, without any pre-exiſtent matter. *So that things which are ſeen were not made of things which do appear.* 2*ly*, He brings the Almighty ſpeaking to the Word, to his Son, *and thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid the foundation of the earth.* Is this a Trope, an Allegory, or a reality? Is it a real or a Metaphorical founding of the earth, and working the Heavens? Do created beings periſh and decay really or Metaphorically? Is the World's deſtruction real, or only Figurative?

No Man ever indulg'd his fancy to that degree as to call this an Allegory: It is then a real and actual Creation. *Thou haſt laid the foundation of the earth.* It was done *in the beginning*, before any thing did exiſt, or began to be. The conſequence then is as

bright

bright as the ſun, that as he who has given a beginning to any thing, is before that thing which he has given a beginning to; ſo *Chriſt* is pre-exiſtent and before all created beings, ſince it appears by the expreſs Authority of the Scripture that he has given a being to the whole Creation. I paſs by that Elegant Deſcription of an Eternal Being, who is always the ſame incapable of change, and not mov'd even in the general deſtruction of all things.

But hold, ſays the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 17. You are in a mighty miſtake. "This ſeems indeed appli'd to Chriſt *Heb.* 1. 10. But *Thomas Aquinas* obſerves that it may be underſtood of God only, not *Chriſt*. *Grotius* tells you, and ſo do *Eſtius* and *Camerarius* that this Text muſt be referr'd to *v.* 13.

Hold again ſays the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn pag.* 10, 11. "This is an Allegory, and muſt be underſtood as the new Heavens, and the new Earth ſpoken of, *Eſay.* 65. 17. and 66. 22. 2 Pet. 3. 13. *Revel.* 21. 1. which all the Trinitarian Interpreters have underſtood of the Goſpel ſtate of things in oppoſition to the Jewiſh, which is antiquated and done away; agreeable to the aſſertion of Chriſt *Matt.* 24. If this is not ſatisfactory, there is another ſhift ready. He tells you, "That others of his party take this as an Apoſtrophe, converſion, and devout addreſs to God, not intended of our Saviour.

The Allegory has ſo much the more weight, that it comes from the Allegorical *Hugo Grotius*, to whom may be appli'd what the 5*th* General Council ſaid of *Theodore of Mopſweſt*, that rather than be convinc't, He would turn the plaineſt truths into Allegories. But for all that, theſe Gentlemen are in the wrong. St. *Peter* ſpeaks of the end of the World, and of the deſtruction of all things in the laſt day. The 24*th* of St. *Matthew* is of the ſame ſtrain; and though ſeveral

learned Men have underſtood theſe places of the deſtruction of *Jeruſalem*, yet they have agreed that it contains alſo that of the whole World. *Chriſt anſwers his diſciples firſt*, ſays *Tertullian* de Reſurr. car. follow'd in this by very many of the Fathers, *of the time of the ruine of Jeruſalem, and then of the end of the World.*

The notion of the Apoſtrophe, or addreſs to God, is ſcarce worth any notice, and time is too precious to ſpend it in anſwering trifles of that nature. It is like that of *Socinus*, and I believe flows from it, that theſe words are not ſpoken of the Son, becauſe with the conjunctive particle *and*, there was not, *rurſum*, *again*. An ordinary meaſure of commom ſence will ſhew the vanity of this. Let ten thouſand People read this Chapter, and theſe two Verſes in particular, *But to the Son he ſays, Thy Throne O God ... and thou Lord in the beginning haſt laid*, but will think them to be ſpoken to the ſame Perſon. No not that plain Countryman who hearing his Parſon read theſe words of St. *Paul, thought it not robbery*, did fancy that the *It*, was not in the Original. Anſ. to Mr. *Milbourn pag.* 36.

I muſt beg theſe Gentlemens Pardon, If I am forc't to ſay, that they are guilty, in their Diſputes, of an unparallel'd Injuſtice. The Scripture ſpeaks of a real Creation. It mentions one alſo which is Allegorical. Some Interpreters, and not all the Interpreters, according to their large way of talking, have underſtood the places which they have cited out of *Iſaias* and the *Revelation* of this laſt, Therefore right or wrong, they muſt be appli'd to the firſt. Rather than give up the Argument, they will give over the litteral ſence of a Text which is capable of no other; and run to the Metaphorical which by no means can agree with it. It is confeſt on all hands, that the Prophet in the words in diſpute; ſpeaks of a real, actual Creation, and

and of a real, actual Deſtruction of the Word. It is alſo confeſt, that the words are addreſt to the real actual Creator of the World, to that Eternal God, who in the change and alteration of all things, is himſelf incapable of change. This they themſelves do not deny. The Apoſtle brings in the Father ſpeaking to his Son; attributing to him that real actual Creation, as to the real, actual Creator; and becauſe this is plain, evident, and unanſwerable, then the Apoſtle muſt be made to ſpeak in an Allegorical and Figurative way. This is ſuch a method of arguing, which, I durſt almoſt ſay, is ſcandalous. I honour *Grotius*, but I would borrow an impertinence of no Man to elude a viſible Truth.

That this Doctrine of the real and actual Creation of all things by *Chriſt* is not deliver'd obſcurely, or by the by, but is the conſtant and univerſal Doctrine of Scripture, appears from *Coloſ.* 1. 15. and foll. *v. Who is the image of the inviſible God, the firſt born of every Creature: For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in earth, viſible and inviſible, whether they by Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers: All things were created by him, and for him, and he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt.* There is not a word in this but what invincibly proves the queſtion, and this after ſo clear a manner, that it leaves no room for Allegories, figures or any ſuch poor ſhifts. Paſſing by the firſt expreſſion, *the image of the inviſible God*, of which we ſhall have a further occaſion to ſpeak; The Apoſtle ſays poſitively of *Chriſt*, that *he is the firſt born of every Creature*, that is, born before all Created Beings, which is the true rendring of πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως *Primogenitus omnis Creaturæ*, reads the old latin, that is, *genitus ante omnem creaturam* ſays *Tertullian lib.* de *Trin. born before any creature.* The paſſage of that Father is home to the thing. It was before any of theſe diſ-

putes, and shews exactly the sence of the Western Church in the Primitive Times. *Quomodo Primogenitus esse potuit, nisi quoniam secundum Divinitatem ante omnem creaturam ex Deo Patre sermo processit? How could he be the first born, but that in respect of his Divine nature The word proceeded from God the Father before any thing was created? Origen. lib. 2. contr. Cels.* to an objection made by *Celsus*, that he whom we assure to be God, and suppose to suffer so willingly, could not forbear cryes and lamentations, answers, That he does not discern the difference of the Scriptures Expressions: That *Christ* speaks sometimes as *Man*, and sometimes as *God*. *We have laid down*, says that Father, who also writ before these disputes and shews the sence of the Eastern Church, *that in Jesus those expressions are to be found which belong to none but him who is born before any creature, such as is, I am the way, the truth, and the life; others again which belong to none but to Man, such as is, but now you seek to kill me, a Man who has told you the truth.* The firstborn here then is not the must beloved, though understood so by the Hebrews and Hellenists in several places, nor in respect of the Resurrection from the Dead, as St. *Paul* calls him, or in relation to his dignity as *David* is stil'd, *Ps.* 68. 27. but in regard of his antemundane existence, of his Eternal nature, according to his Divinity, say both *Origen*, and *Tertullian*.

Nor indeed can it be otherwise. *For by him were all things created.* The first born can have here no other sence then born before all created beings. Or else how could all things have been created by him. *He is call'd* πρωτότοκος, says the great and holy Archbishop of *Milan*, *that by the words born, and begotten, he may be distinguisht and excluded from all that is made or created.*

The Apostle not only asserts his creating power, and his actual excercise of that power in general, by saying,

ſaying, that he has created all things; but he alſo deſcends to a moſt exact enumeration of created beings; Thoſe that are in Heaven, thoſe that are in earth, thoſe that are viſible, thoſe that are inviſible; even the Heavenly Hierarchy, Thrones, Dominions, Principalities, and Powers.

He repeats it again with this addition, that as *Chriſt* is the beginning, he is alſo the end of all Creatures, the *Alpha* and the *Omega*, a name which God alone aſſumes. He gives a being to all that is, and none is but by him. But at the ſame time himſelf is the end of all their operations. It is for his glory that they are created. *All things are created by him and for him.*

He ſums up the whole and aſſerts anew that he exiſts before any thing created, and by him what is created is preſerv'd. *And he is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt.*

I wiſh theſe Gentlemen would ſhew me the difference between theſe laſt words, *and by him all things conſiſt*, and thoſe of the Apoſtle, Act 17. 28. *in him we live, and move, and have our being*, which they own to be ſpoken of the Almighty. I would beg of them to tell me whether any part of Scripture, even the 1*ſt* of Geneſis is more exact, more litteral, more circumſtantiated then this? I pray them, if this be not a real Creation, and a real Creator, to let the World know by what plainer terms they can be inform'd. I ſhall be thankful to any who will ſatisfy me ſubſtantially, whether any thing that is ſaid here can agree with the Son of *Mary*, if he has no exiſtence but that of the nature which he had of his Mother.

I proteſt I am aſham'd to repeat what the Author of the Brief Hiſt. calls an anſwer to this *pag.* 38. 1*ſt*, He ſays, "That Chriſt is call'd the firſt born of e-"very Creature not abſolutely, as if he was in being "before all other Creatures, but the meaning is, he

" is the first born from the dead of all God's Crea-
" tures .... that thus in this very context is the first
" born explain'd. *v.* 18.

That *Christ* is call'd in the 18. *v.* the first born from the dead is freely acknowledg'd, not only for the reason alledg'd by them, that he rose to dye no more, but many other more solid which they have not expreſt for fear they should interfere with the belov'd System. But what is this to the purpose. *Christ* is the first-born all the wayes that the word can be understood in. He is the first-born from the dead, because the first of all Men, he rose from Death to Life, after so miraculous a manner. He is the first-born of every Creature, because he exists before any created being. I deny that the 18. *v.* has any relation to this. The design of the Apostle is to shew, that Christ in all things has the pre-eminence. He has it in the natural order of things, because he is superior and antecedent to them. He is born before all Creatures. He has it in the Mystical and spiritual order, because he is the head of the body the Church. He is the beginning the source of all Grace. He is the foundation of our peace. He is the first born from the dead, the first and great instance, the visible assurance of that glorious immortality God has promis'd to our obedience. But it is a fallacy usual in these Gentlemen's Writings to reason *à dicto secundum quid, ad dictum simpliciter*, to turn a particular into a general interpretation.

But 2*ly*, says the Author of the Brief Hist. in the *page* cited; these words, *for by him were all things created*, are not spoken of Christ but of God. I commend them to own that those things can be said of none but God. This in their own confession proves *Christ* to be God, for all this is said of him. What? Have these Gentlemen receiv'd from above a power to put out People's Eyes, and to invert the sence of

all

all Mankind? The contents lye thus; *Who*, God, *has deliver'd us from the power of darkneſs, and has tranſlated us into the Kingdom of his dear Son: in whom we have redemption through his blood even the forgiveneſs of Sins. Who is the image of the inviſible God, the firſt born of every Creature: For by him were all things created that are in Heaven .... All things are created by him and for him, and he is before all things ... and he is the head of the body the Church*, &c. I ſay what I have ſaid before. Let this be read to ten thouſand Men, and I give up the cauſe, if any one of them who is not quite void of ſence does not confeſs, that this is ſpoken of the Son. The miſtake of thoſe Gentlemen is ſo much the worſe, becauſe it is willfull, the Particles us'd here, which join the whole, and make it all of a piece, *and*, *for*, *by*, rendring it altogether impoſſible.

3*ly*, The Author ſays again, that the moſt learned and Critical of our Interpreters do not think that Creation is in this attributed to Chriſt. He cites ſome mordern, and even ſome Fathers, who do not read *Created*, but *Modell'd*. The ſence which he makes is this, "That the Lord *Chriſt* is ſaid to Model, or "order all things on Earth, becauſe of the great change "he has introduc'd, aboliſhing Judaiſm, and Paganiſm, "and introducing Chriſtianity in their ſtead. He new "order'd or modell'd the Thrones ..... and other "Angelical Orders in Heaven, in that he became their "King, and their Head, whereas before the were "immediately under God, and gives them from time "to time ſuch Orders as to him ſeems good.

Thus that ingenious Man flyes from branch to branch without finding where to reſt. He has found this in *Grotius*, and has taken it up for want of ſomething more ſolid. If this way of criticiſing is allow'd, there is nothing in Scripture capable of a litteral ſence. A warm Fancy, and a great deal of Confidence will make the Sacred Book a continu'd Metaphor. How

eaſy

eaſy would it be to do that with the firſt Chapter of *Geneſis*, which thoſe Gentlemen have done with this, and indeed with any thing in Scripture which is never ſo litteral? He has cited *Athanaſius*, and *Cyril*; but not the places where they read *Modell'd*. Till they are quoted, what can be ſaid to it, is, that it cannot but be known, even to them, that both theſe Fathers, with all the ancients, and even the *Arrians* themſelves, acknowledge Chriſt the Creator of the natural World. But if *Grotius*, The Jeſuit *Selmero*, and *Montanus* have read, *Modell'd*, I cannot ſee what advantage comes to their cauſe from the rendrings of private Men. All the Greek Copies read *Created*. The old Latin, *Created*. All the publick Tranſlations that I know in the World read *Created*. I am not ſenſible that there is any one place in Scripture where the word κτίσις is not render'd *Creation*, and κτίστης *Creator*. Nor do I underſtand why it ſhould be *Modell'd* here, and not every where elſe? Muſt we ſay *Rom.* 1. 21. *That the inviſible things of him from the Modelling of the World are clearly ſeen*; and not from the Creation? *Rom.* 8. 19. 21. *The earneſt expectation of the thing Modell'd waits for the manifeſtation of the Children of God. The Modell'd it ſelf ſhall be deliver'd from the bondage of corruption. For the whole Modellſhip groaneth and travelleth untill now.* muſt we ſay, 1 *Pet.* 4. 19. *committ the keeping of their ſouls to him as unto a faithful Modeller.* Many more inſtances of this kind might be produc'd, which if thus tranſlated, and why not thus in other places as well as here? are down right impertinence.

But granting that rare word *Modelling*, ſtill it does not ruine but ſuppoſe the Pre-exiſtence. He is before all things, and by him all things conſiſt. The things ſpoken of here are not reduc'd only to the preaching of the Apoſtles. It includes that of the Prophets, and reaches to all the Types of the *Meſſias*.

The

The Figures were to be Modell'd as well as the realities. Not only the Generation which comes after *Chriſt* is ſav'd by him; but alſo that which preceeded him. *Chriſt* then being the Saviour was to be the *Modeller* of both. *David* and *Solomon* were Figures of *Chriſt*, He muſt therefore have been before them to *Model* them. *Joſhua* and *Moſes* are ſaid by all the Fathers to have been eminent Types of the Holy *Jeſus*. He muſt then of neceſſity have preceeded him to *Model* him. *Adam* was alſo a Figure of *Chriſt*, and conſequently to be *Model'd* by him. The natural Heaven and Earth are a ſhadow of the new Heavens, and the new Earth, wherein dwells righteouſneſs; Therefore Modellable by the Saviour. Therefore he muſt have exiſted before them to *Model*, and to ſpeak this Author's own words, to order, diſpoſe and prepare them to anſwer thoſe great ends for which they were created.

I will ſay to the acute Author of this Hiſtory once for all what the Anſwerer to Doctor *Wallis* tells that Reverend Perſon, *pag.* 17. "This may be call'd a *fineneſs*, (He means a *fineneſſe*) a ſubtlety, a querk, nor "an accurate reaſoning, or a ſolid and true Anſwer. "And *pag* 18. But ſo it is, that they that maintain "a falſe Opinion, muſt anſwer to the preſent Exigent, ſometimes this thing, ſometimes the contrary. "Only truth is ſtable, coherent, conſiſtent with it "ſelf, always the ſame.

I will end this Letter with that wiſe reflexion, and ſo remain,

SIR,

Your Moſt humble
Servant. *L.*

THE

THE Third LETTER.

SIR,

WHAT has been ſaid concerning the Pre-exiſtence of *Chriſt* is enough to overthrow the Socinian Syſtem, and ſuppoſes his Pre-eternity. We have this advantage, that the one proves the other. For if nothing is before time but what is Eternal, there being no duration conceivable by us, but Time, and Eternity: ſhewing, that Chriſt exiſted before Time it ſelf was, implies his Eternal Being. That by him all things were created the *Arrians* themſelves could not deny, forc'd to it by the great evidence of the Texts alledg'd before. But whatſoever creates is infinite in the general confeſſion both of Divines, and Philoſophers. It ſuppoſes an unlimited power in the agent which nothing can reſiſt and every thing muſt obey; at whoſe Call matter is produc'd and preſents it ſelf to be actuated into what form he pleaſes. But if whoſoever creates is infinite, and Almighty, and whoſoever is infinite and Almigthy, is alſo Eternal, The ſame Texts which ſo evidently prove the Creation of all things by him, do alſo prove his Eternity.

But even paſſing by all this, I preſume to ſay, that if *Chriſt's* Eternal Being is not clearly and plainly deliver'd in Scripture, there is nothing plain, or clear in the World. I will begin by the 1*ſt* of St. *John*. An Authority of that weight and extent, that all that is diſperſed

diſperſed in the other Books of the Sacred Writers concerning the nature of *Chriſt*, ſeems to be collected in this. There is no complaint here of mutilation of Sentences, of alteration of words: As it was deliver'd at firſt, ſo it has been preſerv'd, a clear and a laſting teſtimony of this Sacred Doctrine.

I admire what makes the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn pag.* 20, 21. ſo angry with St. *Jerom* for ſaying that at the requeſt of the Aſiatick Biſhops, St. *John* Writ his Goſpel to aſſert the Divinity of Chriſt; which this Father pretends not to aſſure upon his own credit, but that of the Church's Hiſtory. This Author ſays, "That *Irenæus* 200 Years older then St. "*Jerom*, is ſilent about it. That *Origen* the great "ſearcher of the Monuments of Antiquity gives no "ſuch account; and *Euſebius* himſelf, who has pre-"ſerv'd what is ſaid here of *Origen*, who beſides had read "*Hegeſippus*, and whatever Hiſtory St. *Jerom* could "have read, ſays, that the deſign of St. *John* in wri-"ting his Goſpel, was to ſupply the omiſſions of the "other three Evangeliſts.

Yet after all this the learned World knows, that St. *Jerom* was a ſerious and a candid Perſon; of a temper not to impoſe, or be impos'd upon; of a quick apprehenſion, vaſt parts, prodigious reading, well acquainted with the affairs of the Eaſtern Church; and of whom it is not imaginable, that he would either cite a Book which he had not ſeen, or give credit to a Hiſtory that had not been genuine, and authentick. The anſwerer calls it in vain, "A Legend, a Fiction, "a great Romance. of an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory cited "by St *Jerom*, and ſeen by no body but himſelf.

No Man of ſence or learning will believe any thing of this. A negative proof goes a great way, but it muſt be better grounded then this. *Irenæus* does not ſay it, it is true, but he ſays nothing to the contrary. He ſpeaks of the place where the Goſpel was written,

ten, but not a word of the occaſion of St. *John's* writing it. The teſtimony of *Origen* is reſolv'd into that of *Euſebius* who reports it, and that of *Euſebius* himſelf is nothing againſt St. *Jerom*; ſince the Author of the anſwer owns that the ſame *Euſebius* relates this writing of the Goſpel of St. *John* to aſſert the Divinity of *Chriſt* from the inſtitutions of *Clem. Alex.* Who is in the right then? The Author of the Anſwer, who ſays that St. *Jerom* cited an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory which he never ſaw, or St. *Jerom* who by the Author's own confeſſion has taken theſe words out of *Clemens* preſerv'd by *Euſebius* in his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. The caſe is very plain. The Author of the Anſwer to *Milbourn* is miſtaken.

But then he muſt fall foul upon *Clemens Alexand.* an ancient Writer and a Learned Man. He makes *Photius*, upon whoſe Characters of Men, no Critick ever rely'd, to give him a very ill one; Not obſerving that *Euſebius* accuſes him of neither Impiety, nor Error; and that *Clemens Alex.* has ſaid nothing in this but what moſt of the Fathers have ſaid, not indeed as to the particular matter of fact of St. *John's* being deſir'd to write, but as to the other, that the deſign and principal part of his Goſpel, is to aſſert the Divinity of our Saviour. Is it not on this that St. *Cyprian*, *Lactantius*, *Tertullian*, *Gregory* the *Nazianzene*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Baſil* the Great, have inſiſted? Was not this very Chapter admir'd both by Chriſtians and Heathens? Was it not the Hammer of *Arrianiſm* in the Council of *Nice*, as afterwards of *Neſtorianiſm*, of *Eutychianiſm*, and of all the unhappy Sects which diſturb'd the peace of the Church?

But that cannot be, ſays the Anſwerer, *pag.* 22. "The Goſpel it ſelf will beſt decide the Queſtion. "If St. *John* has more overthrown the Divinity of "*Chriſt*, than confirm'd it, then certainly he has not "writ this Goſpel to aſſert it. Right! but how will this

this be prov'd? He thinks that it will eaſily be done, by ſhewing out of this Goſpel that *Chriſt* is the Meſſenger of God, that the Father taught him, and commanded him. *Joh.* 17. 1, 2, 3. *Joh.* 12. 49. and 14. 10, *&c.* This I confeſs proves the humanity, but how does it deſtroy the Divinity of *Chriſt*? How is it againſt the deſign of St. *John* to delineate him truly God, becauſe he has repreſented him truly Man? He is not God becauſe he is Man, is an ill way of arguing. The *Arrians* themſelves were too ſharp to fetch their Arguments againſt the Divinity of the Saviour from his humanity. Prove him only a Man, a meer Man, without any other nature, or elſe all this reaſoning is a begging of the Queſtion.

But what is all this to the accuſation laid on St. *Jerom*? St. *John* has ſhew'd in his Goſpel the Humanity of *Chriſt*. Therefore St. *Jerom* is in the wrong to aſſure that he was intreated by the *Aſian* Biſhops to ſpeak more expreſly to his Divinity. This is at beſt a ſort of a very ſlender conſequence.

Thus it is, Sir, that the *Socinians* are bafflʼd by falſe and ſenceleſs tranſlations ſupported by fictions and legends, exclaims this Author! He ſhould have ſaid, thus it is, Sir, that the *Socinians* are miſtaken; Their zeal for their opinion tranſporting them too far. Thus it is, that two Eminent Fathers are abus'd who were the admiration of their Age and the veneration of ours!

The truth is, this Chapter pinches ſo hard, that theſe Gentlemen are always uneaſy at its leaſt approaches. They have done all that Men can do to make it ineffectual, having left nothing unattempted, no turns of wit, no ſtrains of fancy, no obſervations, no Criticiſms, no Shifts, no Evaſions; But all to no purpoſe. For truth is great and irreſiſtible; it is plain and evident; it comes from God, and eaſily overcomes all the oppoſitions Men make againſt it.

Joh.

Joh. 1. 1. and foll. *In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.* That this is ſpoken of *Chriſt*, and that *Chriſt* is the word is agreed of all hands. The firſt aſſertion then of the Evangeliſt is, that Chriſt was before all things; that he exiſted before they had a beginning. There is a great Emphaſis in the word *was*, which does not expreſs here a created a dependent being, but a Superior, an Eternal and Divine Nature. Thus *Jehovah* render'd by the Greeks ὁ ὤν, *who is*, gives the true notion of God; and thus it is ſaid of the word that he *was*, ὑφίστο, as the Greek Fathers explain'd it, did ſubſiſt in a moſt eminent way, and incommunicable to a Creature.

To make this good, St. *John* ſays, that *he was with God.* He could not exiſt in any Creature whatever, let it be never ſo great, noble, or perfect, becauſe he exiſted before any thing was Created, *before the World was.* Joh. 17. 5. He could not be in time, becauſe no time was yet, when he was. Therefore he was in God, and with God from Everlaſting. *Who before all Ages*, ſays the great *Ignatius*, a Man of the Apoſtolick times, Epiſt. ad *Magneſ. was with the Father, and was manifeſted in the laſt times. The unchangeable word*, ſays St. *Auſtin*, Epiſ. 49. queſt. 2. *reſiding unchangeably with the unchangeable Father.* From thence the Greek Fathers underſtood the admirable deſcription of wiſdom to be of no other, then the Eternal word, the Son of God. Prov. 8. 22. and thoſe expreſſions, *I was ſet up from Everlaſting, from the beginning, or ever the earth was, before his works of old, when there were no depths, I was brought forth, I was by him, I was by his ſides* ſays the Chaldee Interpreter, all theſe expreſſions they underſtood to be no other then this, *and the word was with God.*

This is ſo plain that I cannot but wonder at the Stir theſe Gentlemen make about the words Inexiſtence,

ence, Eternal Generation, Personality; as if they were hard and unknown terms, the result of Men's Fancies, and a Jargon, as they are pleas'd to call them. The word, or the Son, for they own these words to be Synonymous in Scripture, is said to be from ever with God. Therefore he exists in God, and I think this is Inexistence. A Father and a Son, naturally and of necessity suppose a Generation; or else they can be neither Father nor Son. This is Generation. The Father and the Son are both Eternal, therefore the Generation must be so too. But the Father is not the Son, nor the Son is not the Father, therefore there is a foundation for Personality.

The Evangelist proceeds and lays this 3*d* Axiom, declaring the Divinity as he had done before the Eternity of the word; *and the word was God.* What can be more expres, or positive? What consequence can be more natural? The word was in the beginning, or ever the Earth and the World was. He was with God, and existed in him; Therefore he must be God, *and the word was God.* But the Divine Nature is one, and incapable of division. It cannot be multiplied without destruction. Therefore if the Father is God as it is confest of all hands, and if the word is God, as the Evangelist fully and plainly asserts it, there must be more than one Person, in that one, single and indivisible Deity. These persons must be Co-eval, Co-eternal, Consubstantial.

This shews how mean and low, how strange and far from the Question is the Answer, or rather the Subterfuge of these Gentlemen, which they are never weary of obtruding, that *Christ* is call'd God, as *Moses* and *Solomon* were, and as Magistrates and Princes. I beg the favour, if we do nothing but catch at the word *God*, as they are pleas'd to say we do, to shew me in the sacred Writings some such place as this for *Solomon* and *Moses*. Does any of the Evan-

gelists or Prophets say *in the beginning was Moses, and Moses was with God, and Moses was God? In the beginning was Solomon, and Solomon was with God, and Solomon was God?* They cannot but be sensible how such reasonings might be expos'd.

But though what St. *John* has said is enough to prevent all objections against the Sacred Doctrine, and leave no room for *Arrianism*, *Sabellianism*, and *Socinianism*, yet he prosecutes the Argument, and gives us sensible proofs of his Divinity whom he asserts so positively to be God. *The same was in the beginning with God.* A repetition of great weight which unites all that has been said before to what is to be said after. The word who was in the beginning, The word who was with God, The word who was God, is the same who made all things. v. 3. *All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made.*

The Creation of the World, that is, of all spiritual and material substances, and in a word of all that is, is a most sensible and convincing Argument of a Deity. A work so transcending all finite capacities, that the true God is distinguisht by this from them who pretended to be, but are really no Gods. *Isay.* 45. 12, 18. The assertion of *Heb.* 3. 4. is true both in Divinity and Philosophy. *He that built all things is God.* None but the supream God can do it. Now in what more litteral and accurate way of expression than this, can this creating power be attributed to the word? 1*st*, You have an affirmation of as great an extent as the whole World it self. *All things were made by him.* 2*ly*, Even to prevent the least imagination, that perhaps something was which might have another Author, and be the emanation of some other being; there is the most pregnant, positive and particular Negation that can be; *and without him was not any thing made that was made.* How long shall Men

give the lye to their own reason, and so far espouse an Opinion as to contradict the cleanest truth? He that made all things is truly God. Therefore since we are assur'd that Christ made all things, and that nothing was made without him, he is truly, and really God.

V. 4, 5. St. *John* says, *In him was life and the life was the light of men.* To live is the prerogative of the most High, for whereas all other beings borrow their life from him, he lives independently from them. In this sence he is call'd eminently *the Living God.* Christ then is the principle of life and of light; whatsoever lives, lives by him. He is original Life in the order of nature, because by him Man was made, *Gen.* 1. 26. He is truly Life in the order of Grace, *Joh.* 14. 6. *I am the life.* He is our Life, even when we are dead, *Joh.* 11. 25. *I am the Resurrection and the Life.* He is our life in the order of Glory. 2 *Joh.* 5. 20. *The true God and Eternal Life.* A place we shall examine further.

V. 6, 7. The Evangelist adds, that the greatest amongst the Sons of Men, the other *John*, *Matt.* 11. 11. was sent by God to bear witness that he was come into the World; and for fear Men should be apt to mistake this Messenger of God, for the God himself whose Messenger he was, having so many qualifications above other Men; He tells us *v.* 8. that John *was not that light.* But *v.* 9. that the *word* of whom he has made such an admirable description was that true light, ὁ φῶς ὁ ἀληθινὸν ὃ φωτίζει, that original, that essential light that was to come, which has no beginning, suffers no decay, and diffuses it self so as in some measure or other to enlighten every Man.

V. 10. He tells us that he made himself visible to the World, *He was in the world.* He repeats again, *that the World was made by him*; and to shew the blindness, and ingratitude of the World, he says, that though

he was the Maker and Creator of the World, yet *the world knew him not.*

He aggravates this *v.* 10. *He came into his own*, amongſt thoſe very Men whom he had made, who were his by a muſt undoubted title, even that of Creation; and yet *his own receiv'd him not*, refuſing the adoration and obedince due to him.

V. 12. *To ſuch as receiv'd him, even to them that believe in his name, gave he power to become the Sons of God.* He who is the Eternal Son by Nature, aſſum'd them to the dignity of Sons by Adoption.

From all that the Evangeliſt has ſaid the Eternity and Divinity of the *word* are clear. That he is the ſupreme God, the Creator of all things, the Univerſal and only good of Man is plain and evident. All the difficulty is how he was in the World, came into the World, is the ἐρχόμενος, *he who was to come*, to appear, to be ſeen in the World, the title given him both by the Prophets and Apoſtles. This the Evangeliſt reſolves *v.* 14. *And the word was made Fleſh, and dwelt amongſt us, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.*

Theſe Gentlemen who ask us with ſo much earneſtneſs to ſhew them in the Scripture the words *Godman*, and *Incarnation*, may eaſily ſatisfie themſelves here. The word who was in the beginning, before the World was, who was with God, who was God, who has made all things; The word who is the true light the original life of all that is, who was announc't by the Prophets ever ſince the World began; who had for his Meſſenger the greateſt amongſt the Sons of Men, who is full of Grace and Truth, and of whoſe fullneſs we have all receiv'd, That word was made Fleſh, aſſum'd our Nature, and became Man.

I will end the Explication of this place by theſe two remarks. 1*ſt*, St. *John* ſays *he dwelt*, the original ἐσκήνωσεν, he *Tabernacl'd* amongſt us. A plain alluſion

to

to the Tabernacle to which God was pleas'd to be preſent, or according to the Hebrew, to inhabit. In this ſence the new *Jeruſalem* is call'd, *Rev.* 1. 3. *The Tabernacle of God with men.* The viſible and glorious appearance of God amongſt Men. God then is become viſible in *Chriſt Jeſus.* The *word* the Eternal God, has made the human nature of *Chriſt* the Tabernacle where he ſhews himſelf to Men. 2*ly*, That appearance is call'd by the Greeks *glory*; for ſo the ſeptuagint, ſo all the ſacred Writers in the New Teſtament, render it. *Exod.* 40. 34. *Numb.* 16. 42. 1 *Sam.* 4. 22. 2. *Chron.* 5. 14. *Ibidem.* 7. 1. *Iſay.* 6. 1. *Job.* 12. 41. *Matt.* 25. 31. *Mark.* 8. 38. *Luk.* 2. 9. Therefore as a proof of this appearance of God in the Fleſh, St. *John* adds, *and we beheld his Glory, the Glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father.* Wherein the Particle *as*, ὡς is not a Compariſon, but an Explanation of that glory. And we have ſeen him preſent amongſt us, with ſuch declarations from Heaven, ſuch a train of ſtupendous miracles, with ſuch a glory as could become none but the only begotten Son of God.

I have been ſomewhat large on this place, becauſe it is home to the queſtion, thoſe Texts being deciſive, and ſtaring in one's face. Theſe Gentlemen are ſenſible of it, and have turn'd their Anſwers into ſeveral ſhapes, and ſtill with a kind of miſtruſt, owning and diſowning, taking up, and laying down again, ſometimes oppoſing the litteral ſence, and ſometimes obtruding a poor miſerable Allegory.

The Author of an Anſwer to a letter of Dr. *Wallis* by his Friend touching the Doctrine of the Bleſſed Trinity, conſults in the letter one of theſe Gentlemen who gives him ſeveral explications of this place. The firſt is that which he calls the ancient Orthodox ſence at the Council of *Nice*, and afterwards of ſome centuries. The ſecond of the Modern Orthodox. The third that of the *Arrians.* All *pag.* 9. The fourth is

attributed to *Paul of Antioch*, as he remembers it somewhere related by *Melanchton*, which he owns to be uncouth and strange, *pag.* 10. and the Socinian interpretation *to be forc't and unnatural*, because, says he, we have inbib'd from our youth, and even from our Catechisms contrary Expositions. The first is that of *Grotius pag.* 11. who being the only Man of reputation who has lent them Allegories, is upon every occasion call'd great and *illustrious*. He concludes by saying; "I think I have said enough to convince "any Man that is not extremely prejudic't that "this is *an obscure Scripture*. For as every one of those "Sences finds some specious grounds in the Text, so "never a one of them can clearly answer all the Ob"jections that are levied against them, and that of the "Trinitarians, least of all.

It is then a Text which in his opinion cannot be explain'd. This indeed is strange to a high degree, that a Writer divinely inspir'd, an Evangelist who lays the foundation of a Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and which we are all oblig'd to embrace, is by no means to be understood. It is also very odd, that this should have seem'd clear to all the Ages before, and even to all the Christian Churches of this Age, which all agree in this though they differ in other points, and it should be dark and obscure now to this Gentleman. Admirable that some particular Wits should be made now so different from all Mankind, as to see what all the World before has not seen, and not to see what has been seen by all the World before.

He tells his friend further, "That Dr. *Wallis* has "not done like a Divine, but like a censorious, he "will not say a malicious Person, when he, Dr. *Wallis* "says; if God says, *The word was God*, and *The word* "*was made flesh*, shall we say, Not so, only because we "cannot tell how? As if these sayings were so clear "that they admitted no sence but his. He runs on

"in

" in the difference between *the word* taken personally, " which he says is but seldom, and impersonally, which " he says is very often. He concludes, " That they " have reason to complain of fore't interpretations, " depriving God of an incommunicable Attribute e- " ven his Unity; and of defending their interpreta- " tions with sad distinctions between the Essence and " the Divine Persons, the threefold manner of Ex- " istence in God, Hypostatical Union, Communication " of Properties, &c.

This Gentleman is not sensible that he himself justifies Dr. *Wallis*. And that instead of a censorious, he represents him like a candid Man, when he tells them that is the *How can it be*, that they dispute against. Have they not been perpetually minded that we preserve inviolably the unity of God. That Three Persons subsist in one Divine Nature, because that one God has reveal'd it to be so. Let them deny the Revelation, if they can. But as long as they are angry with the Expositions of the Church concerning how it is; The Doctor is in the right, it is the *How can it be*, that they quarrel with, and upon which they deny the whole.

But after all this, what should we say if this Gentleman, who finds this chapter of St. *John* so obscure, and the Catholick interpretation, the most unreasonable of all, with never so little help, should find the one clear, and the other highly rational. He has himself shew'd us the way in the same Letter *pag.* 9. The consulting Friend reading to him the Drs. Letter he comes to this place *John* 1. 1, and the 14. *The word was God*, and; *The Word was made Flesh*. This says the Gentleman, who was consulted, were to the purpose, " If by this term, *The word*, could be meant " nothing else but a Pre-existent Person, and by the " term *God*, nothing but God Almighty the Creator " of Heaven and Earth; and if taking those terms in

" those sences did not make St. *John* speak nonsence; " and if by *Flesh* could be meant nothing but a Man, " how excellent soever, and not a Mortal Man, sub- " ject to infirmities; but all these things are other- " wise."

Will this Gentleman stand to this? Will the Author of the Brief History, and the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, and the humble adorers of *Gratius* his strain'd and Allegorical Explications, put the thing upon this issue? 1*st*, He does not deny the *word* to signify a Person, but only a Pre-existent Person. Nor can he deny him to be pre-existent, since he was before all things began to be; since by him all things were made. 2*ly*, He cannot deny that the term *God* is meant of the Almighty, since the God with whom the *word* was is undoubtedly the Almighty, and the *word* being said here to be *God*, and God being but one, the *word* must be that Almighty God. 3*ly*, He will not offer to deny that the term, *Flesh* here is nothing but our human Nature, and that the *word made Flesh* implies the word being made Man. This Author then has plainly answer'd himself, and ruin'd all that he pretended to say to his Friend. But as for this strange sort of an *If*, and if, says he, taking those terms in these sences, did not make St. *John* to speak *nonsence*, I will pray him to take to himself, what the Author of an Answer to Mr. *la Motte* has gravely and justly say'd to him, *pag.* 3. " That to speak so of the Apostles is ill " manners, nay 'tis Unchristian and Impious.

But then comes the Author of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*. He will not have the Creation spoken of in this Chapter to be understood of the natural, but of the spiritual World. By the spiritual World he means the State of the Gospel, by the other, the spiritual World. He says *pag.* 26. " That the *Socini-* " *ans* commonly suppose that St. *John* speaks here of " the New Creation, even that great change of affairs

" in the World which has been ſo conſiderable that " the Scriptures have divers times call'd it *the new* " *Heavens and the new Earth.*

He begins the charge *pag.* 23. with a rule of Criticiſm, " That the writers of the New Teſtament " have a particular regard to the notions and Opini- " ons of the Jewiſh Church, as alſo to the Cuſtoms " and Forms of Speech in uſe amongſt the Jews. This " is one of theſe forms that the *Meſſias*, the *Chriſt*, " call'd the *word* by their *Chaldee* Paraphraſes, and by " *Philo*, the Jew, ſhould make a new and a better " World, and that the World was made for him. This the Gentleman has borrow'd from *Grotius* the only Friend in diſtreſs. " Moreover they us'd the " words *El* and *Elohim* which in Greek and in Eng- " liſh ſignifie *God*, of Angels, Kings, Magiſtrates and " all ſuch as are extraordinary Meſſengers, or Mini- " ſters of God. This he calls *Keys* to let us into the " ſence of thoſe Verſes without multiplying Gods, " as we do, or Creators as the *Arrians* have done.

He tells us; " That in the beginning is not from " the very firſt, from for ever, or from all Eternity. " *Moſes* beginning with the ſame words does not " mean as we do. *Moſes* means only in the begin- " ning of the World; *John* means only in the begin- " ning of the Goſpel ſtate. *In the beginning was the* " *word*, He intends here to ſay in the beginning was " the *Meſſias*, or *Chriſt*, whom the Jews call'd *the word*. " That it is not eaſy to determine why the Jews " gave the *Meſſias* the name of *Word*. But 'tis evident, " why St. *John* does it, for as at *v.* 7, 8, 9. He calls " him *the light*, becauſe he was the bringer of the Goſ- " pel light, for the ſame reaſon he is content alſo to " call him *the word*, becauſe he was the Meſſenger of " the Goſpel word ..... which is indifferently to " be call'd the Goſpel, or the word of God. This " you have *pag.* 24.

The

The word was with God, and the word was God. Here the Author grows somewhat hot, not to say, rude. He tells us, that his Oppofers will not deny what every petty Grammarian knows, that we should have tranſlated thus: *The word was with The God*, and, *The word was A God.* He claims this Tranſlation as abſolutely neceſſary for clearing the meaning of the Evangeliſt in that place. He ſays not *the word was with God*, but, *with the God.* Becauſe θεὸς, or *The God* is always us'd to ſignifie the true God, or him who is God by way of Exceſſence and Appropriation, as the Grammarians ſpeak. But θεὸς, *A God*, is in Holy Scripture appli'd to Angels, to Kings, to Prophets ..... *Moſes* is call'd ſo, and ſo muſt the *Meſſias*, who is no leſs than *Moſes*, the Ambaſſador and Repreſentative of God.

He was with the God. The meaning is, "That "before he enter'd on his Office he was taken up into "Heaven, to be fully inſtructed and inform'd in the "nature and quality of his Office.

Pag. 25. He ſays, "Their Oppoſers have nothing "to ſay to this Explication of theſe words, but they "deny Chriſt to be Call'd God as *Moſes*, becauſe it "is ſaid, *All things were made by him, and without him "was not any thing made that was made*, and becauſe, "*the World was made by him.*

I tell you, Sir, it is very dangerous to have to do with Criticks. The Author ſays, that this is a bold Tranſlation. He challenges us to deny, that the Greek preposition which is render'd *by*, might have been render'd *for.* Thus the ſence ſhould have been, *All things were made for him*; *The world was made for him.*

"That that makes this Tranſlation certain is, firſt "that maxim, that *the world was made for the Meſſias:* "and 2*ly*, That Irrefragable Argument, that there "is no other Creator but God; and that the word

"being

"being distinguish't from *the* God, and thereby deny'd "to be *the* God, this Translation must hold good. You have this *pag.* 26.

The short is, says he, "If St. *John* speaks of the "old Creation, and of the visible World, then the "Translation must run, *All things are made for him*, "to preserve the allusion to the known saying of *all* "*things being made for the Messias.* If he speaks of the "new Creation, the World which the *Messias* should "make, then the Translation must run, *all things* "*were made by him.*

The rest, says he, is easy, "*The word was made Flesh, and dwelt amongst us.* "The Translation is ill. They should have render'd it, *the word was Flesh.* "They render themselves the Greek word, *v.* 6. not, "*was made*, but, *was* only. All this is put into a pretty Paraphrase.

At last he puts the case of the unlearned, and what they are to do who are not acquainted with those precious Criticisms. He resolves it by saying, that they must consult their reason, which will satisfy them that the Trinitarian Doctrine is impossible, *pag.* 28. He says, "We do the same in the Case of *Tran-* "*substantiation*: That Protestants must either come "over to the *Socinians*, or revolt to *Rome*: That "the decision of the Church, and the mere Letter of "Scripture is against us. But if no interpretation of "Scripture is admitted but what is consistent with "reason, both Protestants and Papists must be *Socini-* "*ans.* The Trinity, and Incarnation being more in- "consistent with reason than *Transubstantiation.*

Now one should be apt to think that when an Author undertakes to face all Mankind, that they are mistaken in the sence of a Scripture which they look upon to be the foundation of their Faith, and has not only the simple, and credulous, but the learned and understanding part of the World for 'its Defenders;

He

He ſhould bring ſome reaſon, ſo clear, ſo plain, ſo ſelf evident that the contrary aſſertion muſt appear moſt unreaſonable. This Anſwer has two unpardonable faults. 1*ſt*, The Criticiſms on which it is grounded are every one of them falſe. 2*ly*, It ſuppoſes that which is to be prov'd, the pretended impoſſibility of the thing. The ſence of the Church, ſays he, cannot be admitted, becauſe it is impoſſible. This is ſtill *the How can it be?* If a Revelation is plain and expreſs, and if all the Criticiſms in the World cannot make it otherwiſe, it is to quarrell with the Almighty. It is in ſo many words the aſſertion of Dr. *Wallis* which they have exclaim'd againſt as an injuſtice done to them, and yet remains ſtill true, that God ſay's, *The word was God*, and, *the word was made Fleſh*, and they ſay, Not ſo, becauſe they cannot tell how. Anſ. to Dr. *Wallis* by his Friend *pag.* 11.

1*ſt*, For the Criticiſms. It is a known Maxim amongſt the Jews, ſays the Author, that the World was made for the *Meſſias*, and that the *Meſſias* ſhould make the new World ſpoken of in Scripture by the new Heavens, and the new Earth, that is, the Creation of the Spiritual World. Granting all this, what is it to the queſtion in hand? Therefore he is not the Creator of the old World, is a ſtrange way of reaſoning. If they could prove, that it is inconſiſtent to be Creator of both, it would do them ſome ſervice. The World was made for the *Meſſias*, therefore not by the *Meſſias*, is another wild conſequence, ſince the World may be made by him, and alſo for him, that is, for his honour and exaltation amongſt Man, as all things are made by God, and for God who is the Author, and the end of all things.

Theſe Gentlemen own that the *Meſſias* was known to the Jews under the notion of *the word*: But they ſay it is not certain why they gave him that name. This will appear a vaſt miſtake to any one who is never

never ſo little acquainted with their Writings. It is not my deſign to ſtuff theſe Papers with Jewiſh citations. It ſhall be done if required; But it is clear that they underſtood the *Meſſias* to be the Son of God, and that Son to be *The word*. The famous *Philo* in his Book of Queſt: and Solut. makes the Deity to conſiſt *firſt*, *of him who is the Father of all things*. *2ly*, *Of the other Perſon, or God, who is the* λόγος, *The word of the Father*. He calls him in his Book, *de agricul. The word proceeding from God, his firſt begotten Son*. In his Book *de flamm. Glad. The word is the inſtrument of God by whom the world has been created*. Expreſſions deriv'd from the old Paraphraſts and Commentators. Thus *Jonathan* renders, Iſay. 45. 12. *I made the Earth and created man upon it*; *I by my word made the Earth and created man upon it*. Gen. 3. 8. *and they heard the voice of the Lord God*, is explain'd by the Chaldee Paraphraſt, *and they heard the voice of the word of the Lord God*. Gen. 1. 27. *and God Created man in his own image*, the Interpreter reads, and *the word of God Created man*. Theſe Paraphraſes were the publick interpretations of the Jews, and this Doctrine ſo conſtant among them and particularly amongſt the *Helleniſts*, that in the 2*d* Book of *Origen contr. Cleſ.* The Jew in whoſe perſon *Celſus* diſputes owns freely, that *the word is the Son of God*. This Author then has neither underſtood, nor appli'd as it ought to be, the rule which he has laid down, that the Writers of the New Teſtament had a particular regard to the Opinions and Notions of the Jewiſh Church; and nothing is more viſible than this, that St. *John*, to prove the Creation of the natural World by *Chriſt*, and his Eternal being with the Father, has brought him under the notion of *The word*, to whom, by the conſtant Doctrine of the Jews, and after them of the Fathers, the Creation of the natural World was attributed.

This was one of the *Keys* to let us into the ſence of theſe

these words. They have another, and that is that poor distinction between the God *by nature*, and a God *by deputation*. That the true God is the one, that Christ is the other. That to find out the God by nature, from the God by deputation, it is to be observ'd that the one is *always* call'd ὁ θεὸς, The God. The other only, θεὸς a God. That the very Text in dispute shews it, where, *The word was God* is simply θεὸς without an Article; and where *the word was with God*, who certainly there is the supreme God, is with an Article πρὸς τὸν θεὸν, *with the God*.

Truly, Sir, the first Key was worth little, but this is worth much less. Should I take upon me to offer a poor Criticism, I would say that if any one looks seriously into the sacred writings, he will find that there is no care at all of observing Articles, and that of this, innumerable instances may be produc'd. This distinction has been borrow'd from the *Arrians*, confuted and laugh'd out of doors by the Fathers, and is a poor, mean, miserable shift, without the least solidity in the World. It is overthrown to all intents and purposes in this very Chapter. *V.* 12. *He gave them power to become the Sons of God*, τέκνα θεοῦ, without an Article. *v.* 7. *There was a man sent from God.* παρὰ θεοῦ, without an Article, and yet both these undoubtedly spoken of Almighty God. *V.* 18. θεὸν οὐδεὶς ἑώρακε πώποτε. *No man has seen God at any time*, is without an Article. Not to multiply instances of this without end; nothing shews more evidently the poverty and deficiency of this Criticism, that the God by nature is always express'd with, and the false God, or the God by deputation without an Article, than that *Gal.* 4. 8, 9. where the true God is designedly oppos'd to the false, he is simply call'd God without an Article. *Howbeit then, when you knew not God, you did service to them who by nature are no Gods, but now that you have known God, or rather are known of God.* The εἰδότες θεὸν, and

the

the πάντων θεὸν, is without an Article. Nay *Rom.* 1. 1, 4. even when God is oppos'd to *Chriſt* whom they make a God by office, he is then call'd *God* without any Article at all.

The Criticiſm of the Particle *by*, which ſhould have been render'd *for* is as bad as this. I would beg this Author to produce any one Tranſlation extant at this day, were δι' αὐτοῦ, is not render'd *by him*, or any before *Socinus* who ever dreamt of a Goſpel ſtate, or a ſpiritual Creation out of theſe words of St. *John*. I would pray him to reconcile this Particle *for* with the latter part of this v. *and without him was not any thing made that was made*, and with v. 10. *He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not*. It is another miſerable ſhift, that the new Creation, the ſpiritual World, the World of the *Meſſias* were things univerſally known to the Jews, and the Primitive Chriſtians converted by them. Since it is undeniable that the Jews underſtood no Creation wrought by *the word*, but the natural, nor the Primitive Fathers ever explain'd theſe words of any other. It is ſtrange that this ſhould be ſo clear to the Jews, and to the Fathers, and yet that we ſhould not find ſo much as the footſtep of this ſpiritual, and a conſtant aſſertion of the natural Creation by the *word*. This Author is ſo ſenſible of this, that he does not know where to fix the beloved Criticiſm. If you ſpeak, ſays he, of the natural World, it muſt be render'd *For*. But if you ſpeak of the ſpiritual, it muſt be render'd *By*. Theſe *Ifs* are much like the *Hints* ſpoken of before, which Chriſt gave to his Diſciples that he had been taken up to Heaven, before he came down to preach the Goſpel.

There is another Criticiſm of a vaſt importance. For if it be admitted, ſays, the Author, as it ought to be admitted, it turns the whole context againſt us, and utterly overthrows the orthodox Belief.

We ſhould have tranſlated *was Fleſh*, which makes, a vaſt alteration in the Queſtion. He proves this by the 6. *v.* where ἐγένετο, is render'd not *was made*, but, *was*. Yet after all this, This ingenious Man ſpares us the trouble of ſhewing the vanity of this, and gives up this Text. In the anſwer to the late Archbiſhop *pag* 54. we do not care at all, ſays he whether our Oppoſers read here, *The word was made man*, which is His Grace's reading, or as we do, *The word was man*.

2*ly*, As to their difficulties, The one is the caſe of the unlearned, the other is that of *Tranſubſtantiation*. Upon the Queſtion what the Unlearned muſt do in this difference of readings, he Anſwers, "That he "muſt ſtick to theirs, and that his reaſon will give "him that it is the true, becauſe the thing being "impoſſible and contradictory, ours muſt be falſe. This is a plain begging of the queſtion, and once more, it is to ſuppoſe that which they are to prove. This is ſtill the *How*, with which we have nothing to do, and which all Mankind cannot reſolve, becauſe God propoſes it as the great object of our Faith, and not of our reaſon. They ought to prove, that it is not reveal'd by all the ways by which a reading can be prov'd not to be true, as we do their pretended Criticiſms; but not by imaginary conſequences altogether foreign to the thing propos'd.

I conceive that there are two ſorts of unlearned men. The one are abſolutely illiterate and incapable of any examination not only of theſe diſputes but even of points a great deal more obvious then theſe. A ſort of people who are religious not by reaſoning, but believing; not by inquiry, but Tradition; Not ſo much by the conviction of their minds, as an impreſſion of God's Grace upon their hearts. Theſe can never be *Socinians*. They have a ſtrong, and an invinible inclination to believe, as the Church believes. It

is

is an unſucceſsful undertaking to propoſe to them the various readings of a Text. The other are Men of a good natural and improv'd ſence, of a better education, and of a freer converſation with all ſorts of people; but yet deſtitute of learning to judge of things themſelves. I ſay, that if they are equitable they are leſs in danger of being *Socinians* then the other. A place of Scripture is alledg'd which not only the Church wherein we live, but all the Churches in the World have read, and underſtood in the plain ſence which the words bear, and this from the beginning of Chriſtianity, and there comes in this, or at the end of the latter Age a witty Criticiſer who pretends to acquaint the World, that all the Holy and learned Men who have liv'd hitherto and live to this day have been ſurpris'd, and have ſurpris'd all Mankind, and that this place is not to be read or render'd as they have done, but as himſelf does; I ſay there is no equitable Man, who though unlearned is yet a Man of ſence or underſtanding, but will acquieſce in the receiv'd Doctrine, and look upon this new reading, or rendring, as a deſign or at leaſt a miſtake.

The caſe of Tranſubſtantiation is yet more unreaſonable; and yet Theſe Gentlemen are never weary of urging it. "If you will believe the Trinity, you "muſt believe Tranſubſtantiation. You reject the one "becauſe it is impoſſible; Therefore upon the ſame ac- "count you muſt reject the other, *This is my body* "is as expreſs againſt you, as, *the word was God, and* "*the word was made Fleſh is againſt us.*

But 1*ſt*, Is it not a great injuſtice that theſe Gentlemen, who are as much againſt Tranſubſtantiation as we are, and know that it is not to be found in theſe words, *this is my body*, ſhould make uſe againſt us of a Topick which they themſelves own to be falſe. There is not any one point in Religion which ſome Heretick or other has not attempted. There has not

been an Hereſy, if we believe St. *Jerom*, but has pretended to defend it ſelf with ſome place of Scripture. What ſhould we ſay of one who believes none of their aſſertions to be true, and all the places which they cite to be miſunderſtood by them, and yet would make uſe of every one of them to prove that no part of Religion is true. This is exactly the caſe of theſe Gentlemen. They argue againſt us from a Doctrine which they deteſt, and would infer a parity from a Text which they are ſatisfy'd does not at all prove that which the Church of *Rome* would prove by it. Let them but go round with this, and in a ſhort time there will be no ſuch thing as Religion. God forbid that I ſhould think that they deſign it, but this is the unhappy Conſequence of that ſort of Ratiocinations.

2*ly*, The Author never conſider'd the weight of his aſſertion, *pag.* 29. "That in this point the deciſions of "the Church in Councils and the mere letter of Scri-"pture are againſt us. For if the Church of *Rome* could make it out clearly and ſubſtantially, that the letter of Scripture, and the deciſions of the Church, are of their ſide, not only we, and the whole body of Proteſtants, but theſe Gentlemen themſelves, muſt go over to it. But either of them is falſe. There is no ſuch thing as the letter or the mere letter of Scripture, or any deciſions of the Church of any Antiquity for Tranſubſtantiation. I appeal to this very Author for the truth of this, who however, in the height of diſpute, has let this to ſlip from his pen, is too learned not to know the contrary.

3*ly*, If the diſpute between us and the Church of *Rome* about *Tranſubſtantiation* is truly ſtated it ſignifies nothing to the matter in hand, and that the objection is really againſt them. There is no difference between us, as to the preſence of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament. This is admitted by all the *Societies* of Chriſtians,

ſtians, who pretend to a name in the World. The French Proteſtants, who have ſtray'd in this particular from the Doctrine of the Fathers more than any other, have freely acknowledg'd it in the admirable writings of Mr. *Claude*, againſt the great Monſieur *Arnauld*. The ſober Church of *England*, and Enemy to all extremes, has kept ſtrictly to this, that Chriſt is *truly*, and *indeed* in the Sacrament, without pretending to explain the manner of that preſence. She has own'd that it is Divine, and Incomprehenſible, and look't upon it as a Myſtery, according to the name given to the Holy Sacrament, by the Fathers of Dreadful, Sacred, and Divine Myſteries. The Church of *Rome*, and ſome others, have preſum'd to go further, and to fix the manner of Chriſt's being in the Sacrament. I demand then with what equity theſe Gentlemen can make that Objection, and repeat it, with as much earneſtneſs, as if they reaſon'd upon an undiſputed Principle? The Trinity, and Incarnation, we believe: The *How can it be*, we acknowledge incomprehenſible. We do the ſame of *Chriſt's* preſence in the Sacrament. The Revelation concerning all this is plain, and expreſs. We pretend to no more. It is diſingenuous and obſtinate to deny that any thing is, becauſe we cannot ſhew how it is. Had we deny'd the preſence of *Chriſt* in the Sacrament, the Objection had been of ſome force. But denying only Tranſubſtantiation, that is, the manner of that preſence, it is altogether wide of the queſtion.

Having done with this Author, I paſs to that of the Brief Hiſtory, who did not think this Anſwer of Mr. *Milbourn's* Adverſary ſolid enough to embrace it: But after ſome curſory animadverſions on the Churche's Expoſition, ſhelters himſelf under *Grotius*'s Wings, and delivers that learned Man's Opinion. It is needleſs to tranſcribe it, all that he ſays, *pag.* 26, 27, 28. amounting to this;

Grotius underſtands, as we do, the Creation, here

ſpoken of, to be that of the Natural World. He explains the words, *in the beginning*, as we do, when God created all things, or when all things began to exiſt. He makes, as we do, that word to be not only Preexiſtent, but Eternal. He underſtands, as we do, the word to be with God, and to be God. He reads, as we do, *all things were made by him, and for him.* He renders, as we do, *The word was made Fleſh*, acknowledging that *Fleſh* is the uſual Scripture Phraſe for Man, and ſaying alſo in the Explication of the 10*th* Verſe, that in proceſs of time the word come to be *Incarnate.*

You will ſay then, where does he differ from the Orthodox? For as yet nothing appears contrary to the ſence receiv'd in the Chriſtian World. He differs only in this, that he makes this *word* to be only a property and an Attribute of God, *i. e.* his Wiſdom and Power, but not a Divine Perſon. I wonder that this Author would embrace an Expoſition which really ruines all their little Criticiſms, their charming Allegories, and brings the queſtion to this only difficulty, whether the word is no more than an Attribute, or whether he is a Perſon? Whatever *Grotius* in other places has done for theſe Gentlemen, he has certainly given up the cauſe here by cleaving to the litteral ſence of the words, which indeed he could by no means avoid.

I will only propoſe theſe difficulties. 1*ſt*, If *the word* here is no more than an Attribute or Property, how is he conſtantly ſpoken of here by *he*, and *him. The world was made by him. The world knew him not.* It is ridiculous to ſay, that it is in the ſame manner that *Prov.* 9. 1. Wiſdom is ſaid to build her Houſe, and *David* calls God's Commandments his Councellers; Since in thoſe places is a viſible and a deſign'd Metaphor: But *Grotius* owns here a real, actual, natural Creation of the World, which admits of nothing Figurative.

2*ly*,

2*ly*, If the *word* is no more than an Attribute of God, what can be the meaning of the Evangeliſt, *In the beginning was the word, and the word was God?* What is there in this ſo ſingular, and to what can this lead us? The Wiſdom of God was before all things, and the Wiſdom of God was with God. That is, God was wiſe before the World was Created. Certainly St. *John* means ſomewhat more than this. Why not *in the beginning* was the Power, the Mercy, the Truth, the Holineſs of God, For all this God was before things began to be.

3*ly*, What can be the deſign of this, *and the word was God.* Who ever heard any one ſay, that Wiſdom is God, and Power is God. Nor will it ſerve here to ſay, as the Author of the Hiſtory, That all the Attributes of God, are God; or that the name *Jehovah*, is attributed to Angels, and that *Moſes* is call'd God. Either of theſe anſwers deſtroys the other. For if the Attributes of God are God, then Wiſdom is the ſupreme God, and not as the Angels, or *Moſes*. Or if Wiſdom is call'd *Jehovah*, as the Angels, and *God* as *Moſes*, then all the Attributes of God are not the Supreme God.

4*ly*, If the word is no more than an Attribute what can be made of this? *He was in the world, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own receiv'd him not.* Living in the World, unknown to the World, coming to, and rejected by Men cannot be ſaid of Wiſdom. If it could bear that ſence, the Evangeliſt ſays nothing, ſince before the Goſpel, before *Moſes*, before the Flood, the Wiſdom of God was deſpis'd by Men.

5*ly*, The following words can never be ſpoken in the ſence of an Attribute. *So many as receiv'd him to them gave he power to become the Sons of God, even to them who believe on his name.* Can ſence be made of wiſdom giving us power, or believing in the name of wiſdom.

6ly, If wiſdom is no more than a qualification, how comes this *and the word was made Fleſh*? I remember that theſe Gentlemen value themſelves much upon this notion of the Author of the Impartial Account of the word *Myſtery*, that they cannot believe the Trinity, becauſe they can have no notion of a Trinity. I humbly beg a notion of Juſtice, Prudence, Holineſs, or as here Wiſdom *made Fleſh*. I humbly beg a notion of an Attribute made Fleſh.

7ly, *And we beheld his glory, the Glory as of the only begotten Son of the Father.* I again humbly beg to know, whether the Attribute Wiſdom is the only begotten Son of the Father? I beg a notion of the Glory of God's Wiſdom to be ſeen by human Eyes. No, ſays the Author, you miſtake, it is the Glory of the Man on whom the word did abide. But I muſt beg his pardon, and tell him, that this is too great an impoſition on the ſence of Mankind. Any one who knows ſomewhat more than his A. B. C. knows that *The word* is the ſubject of all that is ſaid here. It is of the *word*, that it is ſaid, that he was in the beginning, that he was God, that he was with God, that he made the World, that he was made Fleſh, that his Glory was ſeen as of the only begotten Son of God. He muſt not, He cannot admit the *word* to be the ſubject of all the other Propoſitions, and deny him to be the ſubject of this.

I beg your pardon for having been ſo long on this Text. But the Anſwers of your Friends being of ſo great an extent, though of ſo different a nature, it was fit to ſhew how weak and unſatisfactory they appear. I then proſecute the Argument, and offer ſome others to your conſideration.

I think that nothing proves the Eternity of God ſo effectually as that place, *Iſay*, 44. 6. *I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God.* This Text is of the New as well as of the Old Teſtament.

St.

St. *John* begins his Revelation by wiſhing us peace *from him which is and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* Nor indeed can we have a clearer notion of that ſupreme being which we call God, than that he exiſts before and after all things, *v* 8. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, ſays the Lord, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty.* This is a Title which nothing that is Created can pretend to; and an Explication of the Sacred Name *Jehovah*, which in the ſence of the Hebrews extends to all the durations imaginable, and ſhews, that in the change of all things, he is permanent and incapable of alteration.

This ſuppos'd, I conceive it obvious that if *Chriſt* aſſumes that name to himſelf; if he ſays of himſelf that he is the *Alpha, and Omega, The firſt and the laſt*; If he often takes that Title, willing to be known by it, making it the ground of a ſolid encouragement to his Diſciples in their Sufferings for his ſake, and if what he ſays can reaſonably be diverted to no other ſence, it cannot be deny'd that he is God with the Father. To ſee whether this is true, read *Rev.* 1. 11. *I am Alpha and Omega the firſt and the laſt*, v. 17. *Fear not, I am the firſt and the laſt*, Rev. 22. 13. *I am Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the firſt and the laſt*; and becauſe theſe Gentlemen are ſo fond of Articles, and build ſuch mighty things upon them, all this is ſpoken with the ſame Articles as in *v.* 8. when it is ſpoken of Almighty God: Which though in truth and reality is no proof at all, yet it is ſo to them who lay ſo great a ſtreſs upon it.

I will add two remarks to this. The 1*ſt*, is that acclamation which in both Teſtaments is made to none but God. v. 6. *to him be Glory and dominion for ever*, and Chap. 5. 13. *and every creature which is in Heaven and on the earth, and under the earth, and ſuch as are in the ſea, and all that are in them, heard I ſaying,*

ing, Bleſſing, honour, glory and power, to him that ſitteth on the Throne, and to the lamb for ever. The 2d. is that admirable deſcription made of *Chriſt*, *Rev.* 19. which tells us, *v.* 13. that he has a veſture dip't in blood, and that his name is *the word of God*; that Eternal word which *Grotius* owns created the World, and all that is in it, which was made Fleſh; and this ſame Prophet ſays, *waſht us in his own blood*, after he had taken our nature upon him, *who has on his veſture, and on his thigh a name written King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, a title which belongs to none but God, which none but the Almighty can aſſume, He alone being the ſource of power, and from whom all other power is deriv'd.

All this the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 44. pretends to evade by ſaying, that *v.* 11. is not in the Latin, nor in any good Greek Copy. It is true, that it is not in the Latin; and that it is wanting in ſome few Greek Copies. But being that it is in ſo many other places in all the Greek and Latin Manuſcripts; It is diſingenuous to accuſe this particular place, and a candid oppoſer ſhould have judg'd, that it can be Attributed to nothing but the neglect of the Tranſcriber. It is in all the aforeſaid places, and beſides *Rev.* 2. 8. ſpoken by him *who was dead, and is alive, who lives and was dead, and is alive for evermore.*

A ſecond Evaſion, and really much worſe than the firſt is what he ſays *pag.* 20. of the Brief Hiſt. to the 17. *v.* That Chriſt is the firſt and moſt honourable with good Men, and the laſt, the moſt deſpis'd by bad Men. He cites for this *Hugo Cardinalis*, from whom *Grotius* and *Eraſmus* have borrow'd it. It is very diverting to ſee a learned Man as the Author of this Hiſtory, to cite in theſe diſputes *Hugo Cardinalis*, but what if the Cardinal, if *Grotius*, if *Eraſmus* have underſtood theſe words in a manner ſo contrary to their real and natural ſence, I ask what

is

is it to the matter in hand? Is it leſs true becauſe *Eraſmus* and *Grotius* ſay, that it is not ſo? Will theſe Gentlemen be contented if inſtead of theſe three names we produce three hundred of a contrary Opinion, a whole Body of Scripture Interpreters who underſtand the words in their litteral ſence?

Briefly, ſays the Author again, *pag.* 21. Both Almighty God, and our Lord *Jeſus Chriſt* are the firſt and the laſt, but in different ſences. Why does he not alledge thoſe ſences? What corner of the Earth hides the precious Treaſure? A Text is produc't which is expreſs, cogent, ſelf-evident, liable to no little Criticiſms; A title Attributed to Chriſt in its utmoſt latitude, without any exception, or reſtriction, capable of no reaſonable ſence but the literal, and inſtead of a ſubſtantial anſwer they tell us, that a certain Author underſtands it ſo and ſo; that it is capable of different ſences, and ſo bid us good night. Thus any ſhift is made an Anſwer, and a bare aſſertion becomes an Argument.

I have often endeavour'd to find out what might be the cauſe of ſo unfair a dealing in an Author who is certainly a Man of learning, and is as ſenſible as my ſelf that the Interpretation of *Hugo* is ridiculous, and impertinent, and that a general Allegation is no Anſwer. The true reaſon I take to be this. They have eſpous'd this notion, that the Trinity and Incarnation are contradictory and impoſſible; read this Author, *pag.* 44, 45. that is, not ſo much the thing as the manner, *The How can it be.* Thus when we who are ſatisfy'd that if the thing is plainly and clearly reveal'd, it becomes the object of our Faith, and excludes any further inquiry into the manner; when we bring thoſe Texts on which no impreſſion can be made, by denying a word, excepting againſt a Tranſlation, exclaiming againſt an Article, or a punctuation, citing any orthodox who by chance favours

their

their explication of ſome particular Text, though otherwiſe an utter Enemy to their Doctrine, they leave no ſtone unturn'd. But when a Text is alledg'd which as this ſtares in the face, then any thing will ſerve, they think that their ſtrength is to ſit ſtill, and rather ſay nothing then not to the purpoſe.

What they ſay to this place Rev. 19. 16. *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*, is of the ſame nature. It is not only a magnificent deſcription of the Almighty; but a notion alſo ſo univerſal, ſo innate to all Mankind, that from this the moſt illiterate ſee the neceſſity of their Obedience to his Laws. The Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 44. ſays to this, that Chriſt is ſo Lord of Lords as that himſelf has one who is not only his Lord, but his God. He cites for this, *Joh.* 20. 17. *I aſcend to my Father, and your Father, to my God and your God.*

This is a bad reaſon and a Text miſunderſtood to ſupport it. The reaſon is bad, for it is plain, that if there is a Lord over him, he is not the Lord of Lords. God is call'd in Scripture *the God of Gods*, and the aſſertion could not be true if there was a God above him. Natural reaſon will teach any Man that none can be Lord of Lords but in an unlimited ſence. Any other abſolutely deſtorys the propoſition.

He has miſunderſtood the place of St. *John*, which does not ſuppoſe any ſuperiority in the Father above the Son; but only expreſs the *ſameneſs* of his nature with him; *Chriſt* ſhews how God is his Father, and how ours; *His by nature in the ſame Deity*, ſays *Epiphanius Her.* 69. *and ours by Grace in the adoption.* Which Text St. *Cyrill* Cathech. 7. and St. *Chryſoſtom* on this very place, explain after this manner. *As he is his Father, ſo is he his God, and his God, becauſe his Father.*

I will conclude this Argument of Chriſt's Eternity by *Joh.* 17. 5. *And now, O Father, glorify thou me, with thy own ſelf, with the Glory which I had with thee, before*

t'e

the world was. *Grotius* obſerves, that this expreſſion *before the world was*, is the common notion which the Jews had of Eternity. *Chriſt* ſays in the preceeding v. *that he has glorify'd his Father on earth.* This Glory which he has acquir'd to God conſiſts *in finiſhing the work which he gave him to do.* In this Verſe he begs of the Father, that as a reward of this, he would alſo glorifie him. He aſſerts to what kind of honour he deſires to be promoted, even that which he had with him *before the World was.* He had then an Eternal, an Eſſential Glory with the Father, which this ſame Evangeliſt had before expreſt by ſaying, that *the word was with God.* It is to this that he deſires his bleſſed humanity to be rais'd. He had then before an Eternal exiſtence with God; For *the word was God*; and he claims that his mortal and paſſible nature my be aſſum'd to a participation of that honour, dignity, and glory which he had from all Eternity.

This Text is full and home. But it receives a great addition from *Joh.* 12. 41. Where it is ſaid, that *Iſaias ſaw his glory, and ſpoke of him.* The Glory ſpoken of here is that of the Eternal God, *Iſay.* 6. 1, 2, 3. He deſcribes not only his Throne and the numerous attendance of the bleſſed ſpirits, but the two Seraphims, who covering their Faces with their Wings, cry'd one to another, *Holy, Holy, Holy, is the Lord of Hoſts*, a name which none but the true God aſſumes. *v.* 9. The Prophet receives his commiſſion in the words repeated by St. *John*, which are a Prophecy of the incredulity and obſtinacy of the Jews. St. *John* declares then the Prophecy to be fulfill'd. He does not leave us to conjecture of whom the Prophet ſpeaks, but tells us plainly, that *theſe things ſaid Iſaias when he ſaw his glory and ſpoke of him.*

" To this laſt Text the Auhor of the Brief Hiſt. anſwers
" 1*ſt*, That the moſt learned of the Orthodox Inter-
" preters, both Fathers and Modern, have confeſt that
" the

" the words of St. *John* are to be underſtood not of " Chriſt, but of God, For God only is intended in " the foregoing Verſe to which the words of this re- " late. 2*ly*, That the beſt Greek Bibles read not *his* " Glory, but God's Glory.

For the firſt, they muſt give me leave to obſerve again, that this is one of their boundleſs citations, and of thoſe Characters of the moſt learned given at random, as this very Author, Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 11. has honour'd *Dyoniſius Petavius* with the title of *the moſt learned of the Jeſuits*, and another of theſe Gentlemen calls him *the moſt learned of the moſt learned order*, contrary to the ſence that his own Society has of the one, though otherwiſe a Man of great worth, and to the opinion which the learned World has of the reſt. The reaſon which they give that God is only intended in the foregoing Verſe, is nothing at all to the queſtion. The difficulty is not neither, whether *Iſaias* ſpeaks of *Chriſt*; but whether it is of him that St. *John* ſays that *Iſaias* ſpeaks; and indeed he muſt be willfully blind, who does not ſee, that all this is ſaid of him, who departed from them, *v.* 36. in whom they could not believe, *v.* 37. of whom all this was Propheſi'd, *v.* 38, 40. even *Chriſt*.

For the 2*d*, that the beſt Greek Bibles read *God's*, and not *his*; It is a great misfortune, that ſo few people can ſee thoſe beſt Bibles, or read the moſt learned of the Interpreters, and that all the ancient Copies, that I know, extant, and all the Printed Editions read unanimouſly *his*, and not *God's*.

But his anſwer to the Text which occaſſion'd this, is much worſe, to *Joh.* 17. 5. he ſays, that the Glory which Chriſt ſays he had *before the world was*, is only meant in God's Decree. He adds, *pag.* 31. but without citing where, " That St. *Auſtin*, and ſeveral " learned Interpreters, not only grant, but contend " that it is ſo: That the ſufferings of Chriſt were to

" preceed

"preceed his Glory, 1 *Pet.* 1. 11. that this Text "ought to be underſtood, as 2 *Cor.* 5. 1. *We have a* "*building of God a houſe made with hands*, and 2 *Tim.* 1. "9. *The Grace which was given us in Chriſt Jeſus before* "*the world began.*

This is little to the purpoſe. It has been obſerv'd already, that St. *Auſtin*, *Aquinas*, and both the Diſciples of theſe two great Men underſtand theſe words of a decree, which I wonder theſe Gentlemen offer ſo much as to ſpeak of; It ſuppoſing what they ſo earneſtly deny, and that is the Perſonal Union of the two natures of *Jeſus Chriſt*. Read the Books *de nat. and Grat. de prædeſt. de perſev. Sanct. Tract. in Joban.* and almoſt every where, and you will find it to be the ſyſtem of theſe two Doctors to which they reduce, not only this place, but all others of like nature; and indeed if you admitt of a decree, you muſt go through with this as theſe two learned Men have done. There is no other in relation to Chriſt can have any room in the Scripture. What is more is only pretended to elude the force of an Argument. Were theſe Gentlemen unconcern'd in the diſpute, and ſhould they hear this Text cited, *Glorifie thou me ... with the Glory which I had with thee, before the world was*, How would it make them merry to hear a decree pretended for that which cannot be conceiv'd but antecedent to that decree? Had *Chriſt* ſaid, Glorifie me with the Glory which thou hadſt appointed, or decree'd for me; It might have ſerv'd. But Glorifie me with the Glory which I had with thee, which was mine, which I was in poſſeſſion of before the Creation, excludes any thing of that nature. The Place cited out of St. *Peter* has no relation at all to this. That of St. *Paul* to the *Corinthians* is as much foregin to it, being only an excellent Metaphor to expreſs our future ſtate. That to *Timothy* is indeed more to the matter in hand, but the Apoſtle has prevented the objection by ſpeaking poſitively

positively of God's decree in respect of our Election. *Who has call'd us with a holy calling, not according to our works but according to his own purpose* ... which word the Author was pleas'd to overlook.

What has been said will give light to some difficulties which these Gentlemen judge to be unanswerable. The *1st*, is taken from this very Chapter, Joh. 17. 3. *and this is life Eternal that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.* The Author of the answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 22. is positive that the Father is call'd *the true God* exclusively to any other; and that nothing can more effectually evince that *Christ* is not God, but only God's Ambassador. This is one of those very many Texts, says the Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 5. which directly affirm, that only the Father is God.

The objection is not new. It was made by the *Arrians* in the Council of *Nice*, and exploded by the Fathers. The truth is, these Holy Men never understood the words, as fixing and restraining the Deity to the Father with exclusion to the Son, and the Holy Spirit, nor their sence to have any regard to either of them; or else this would absolutely have decided the Controversy. Nor is it comprehensible that the Fathers before the Council of *Nice* would have spoken so fully to the Divinity of *Christ*, or that those of the Council of *Nice*, and the Fathers after them, and the whole Christian World durst have embrac't it as an essential part of our Faith, if they had look't upon the sence of this Text to be no other than what is pretended by these Gentlemen. The Good, the wise, the Learned, cannot be conceiv'd to have willfully run into an errour contrary to the open and known sence of such a place of Scripture. They constantly understood these words, *The Father the only true God*, to be spoken not exclusively to the two other persons, but in opposition to the Gods of the Heathen, those false Deities,

Deities, which had usurp't amongst them the place of the true. Nor is it unusual in Scripture by the Father to mean not so much the first Divine Person, as the Deity in general.

I will not spend time in setting down the many ways that this Text may be read in, or what order the words might be made capable of to take off their pretended inconsistency with the Christian Hypothesis of three Persons subsisting in the same Divine Nature. St. *Basil*, and St. *Chrysostom* have effectually done it, and shew'd how the word μόνος which we have render'd *only*, is rather comprehensive than exclusive in the dialect of Scripture.

I have a plain and obvious reason *why the only True God* must be understood in the sence of the Fathers in opposition to false Gods, and not in exclusion of *Christ* and the Holy Spirit; and that is, that *Christ* in Scripture is call'd *the true God*, and *the only Lord God*, which can never be if *the only true God* here must be restrain'd to the Father, as these Gentlemen would have it. 1 Joh. 5. 2. *and we know that the Son of God is come, and has given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ; This,* οὗτος, *ille*, he, *is the true God and Eternal life.* I take this to be positive, and decisive that *the only true God* cannot be understood in relation to the Son or the Holy Spirit, since the Son is also call'd true God.

No, says the Author of the Brief Hist. p. 43. "This "is a very negligent translation, and no sence can be "made of the words. The latter part of the Text "ought to have been render'd, *we are in him that is* "*true, by his Son Jesus Christ*, and not, *in his Son Je-* "*sus Christ.* This Text plainly denys that *Christ is* "*the true God.*

The outlandish *Socinians* had made a miserable exception to this Text, which these Gentlemen thought fit

fit to forſake as ruinous; But this is to the full as bad. The tranſlation is directly againſt them; Therefore it is negligent and nonſenſical. The tranſlators cannot be made to ſpeak as they would have them; Therefore they are careleſs and ſpeak nonſence. The particle *in Jeſus Chriſt*, ruines their opinion; Therefore it muſt be *by*, contrary to the Faith of all tranſlations, contrary to any poſſible conſtruction of the place, contrary to the ſence of all Interpreters.

You ſee, Sir, how deſperate is that cauſe which cannot ſupport it ſelf without theſe mean ſhifts, and has nothing to oppoſe to a plain and deciding Text, but the bold and preſumptuous altering of a Particle. I uſe theſe words, which perhaps may ſeem too ſharp, becauſe the thing of it ſelf is ſo extraordinary, and this Text in the original ſo infinitely clear, that I durſt give up the cauſe, if of a thouſand Tranſlators, ſtrangers to the controverſy, any one does tranſlate *by*, and not *in* his Son *Jeſus Chriſt*.

I think that *Jud.* 4. is much to be conſider'd. There is a deſcription made of unhappy Men, who are crept in unawares. Their Character is to be *ungodly*, *to turn the grace of God into laſciviouſneſs*, and *to deny the only Lord God and Lord of us Jeſus Chriſt*. That the whole is ſpoken of Chriſt appears from the Greek conſtruction of the Phraſe, from the ſingleneſs of the Article and the continuation of the Text without the leaſt punctuation. The whole running thus, *denying Jeſus Chriſt who is the only Lord God and our Lord.* This is ſo obvious that to prove it is to loſe time. It not only aſſerts the Divinity of Chriſt but alſo ſhews how vain is the pretence that in the diſputed Text, *the only true God* ſhould exclude the Son or the holy ſpirit. As if any rational Man durſt infer from thence, that becauſe Chriſt is call'd the *only Lord God*, Therefore the Father is neither Lord, nor God.

Theſe Gentlemen have taken no notice of this Text in

in any of their writings, that I have ſeen, and ſo have ſay'd nothing to it. But yet becauſe a proof muſt be clear and candid; and remove, if poſſible, all objections, what can be oppos'd to it amounts to this. That the old Latin Interpreter and ſome Greek Manuſcripts of a conſiderable Authority, do not read the word *God*, and that *Eraſmus* has tranſlated, not, *the only Lord God and Lord of us Jeſus Chriſt*; But *God, who is the only Lord, and our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. Eraſmus* and one or two more Modern Interpreters, who with all the care imaginable have endeavour'd to obſcure, or prevert all thoſe Texts which ſpeak openly of the Divinity of *Chriſt*, are parties in the caſe, even by the confeſſion of our Adverſaries, and ſo not to be heard. But in this it is viſible even to the moſt zealous *Socinian*, that he has groſly, and ſhameleſly corrupted this Text. The word, *God*, not being in the Text is really an objection; but if truely conſider'd rather confirms than weakens the aſſertion. For *the only Lord* can no more be reſtrain'd to *Chriſt* excluſively to the Father, than *the only true God* can be reſtrain'd to the Father excluſively to Chriſt. The word *God*, adds nothing to the force of the expreſſion, *The only Lord* being a Phraſe of as large an extent and as full an importance as *the only true God*. This takes off at once all the other Texts depending from this, on which this Author has ſo much inſiſted. 1 *Cor* 8. 6. *Eph.* 4. 4, 5, 6. 1 *Tim.* 2. 5, &c.

A 2*d* objection which indeed this Author has not made, though he has ſcarce left a Text untouch't, whether it made for his purpoſe or no, and was a reaſon, or only look't like one; but is made by the Author of ſome thoughts upon Dr. *Sherlock's* Vindication of the Trininy, is taken from Joh. 10. 35, 36. *If he call'd them Gods unto whom the word of God came, and the Scripture cannot be broken, ſay ye of him whom the Father has ſanctify'd, and ſent into the world, thou*

blaſphemeſt, becauſe I ſay'd I am the Son of God. "He "does not ſay, I whom the Father has begotten from "all Eternity, ſays the Author *pag* 4. of his own "ſubſtance, But I whom the Father has ſanctify'd. "Which plainly ſhews that when he ſays he was the "Son of God, his meaning was, that he was only ſo "in a ſence of conſecration and of miſſion; and con- "ſequently that his unity with the Father is not an "Eſſential and natural unity, but meerly moral and "relative, of works, not of Eſſence which is really "incommunicable. *pag.* 6. I ſhould think this paſſage "written with the very finger of truth to be unan- "ſwerable, were it not that I know the Orthodox are "wont to darken the moſt bright light at the coſt of "ſincerity and good ſence, and make no ſcruple of the "groſſeſt contradictions and abſurdities, ſo they may "but caſt duſt in the Eyes of ſimple men.

Paſſing by the complement which is of a ſingular nature, and a barbarous aſperſion on perſons whom they themſelves own to have an extraordinary piety and learning, I muſt beg leave to admire the difference of Men's perceptions. This Author thinks this paſſage to be written with the very finger of truth, and not to be anſwerable. I think ſo too: But he ſays againſt the Eternal being of *Chriſt*, and I ſaw for it. The cauſe of this difference between us lyes here. He fancies that thoſe Verſes are an Explication of what *Chriſt* had ſaid before, *v.* 30. *I and my Father are one*; for which *v.* 31. the Jews took up ſtones to ſtone him, and which, *v.* 33. they call *Blaſphemy, and becauſe that he being a man makes himſelf God*; and that to avoid their anger he declares to them that he is no otherwiſe God, than thoſe very Men who by their law are call'd Gods, not becauſe they are ſo indeed, but becauſe they have the Power, and Authority of God communicated to them.

Now I think that theſe words are not an Explicati-

on,

on, Excuſe, or Apology for what he had ſaid, *I and the Father are one*; But an open and free continuation of what was before, and a new aſſertion of his Divinity. This will appear if the whole context is taken together. Chriſt had ſaid, *v.* 9. that *he is the door, that by him if any man enters he ſhall be ſav'd.* Agreeable to this expreſſion of *Revel.* 7. 3. *He that is holy, he that is true . . . he that opens, and no man ſhuts, and ſhuts and no man opens.* v. 28. *that he gives his ſheep Eternal life*; and that they might not wonder at thoſe Characters which can agree to no creature, he carries yet the point higher. He tells them, v. 30. *I and my Father are one.* That though they ſee him in the form of a Servant and in all things like Man, yet he is God with his Father, and partaker of the ſame Divine Nature. This aſſertion to Men whoſe hearts were not purify'd by Faith ſeem'd ſtrange and impious, *v.* 31. *They took ſtones to ſtone him.* He tells them with that unconcernedneſs which truth and innocence gives, that he has done amongſt them many miraculous works to prove this his Union with his Father. He asks which of theſe works has provok'd their blind zeal to ſtone him? They anſwer him, *v.* 33. that it is not for any of thoſe good and miraculous works, *But becauſe being but a man he makes himſelf*, not A. God, but *God.* He does not at all excuſe the thing, or parts with his firſt aſſertion. He pities but not fear their malice; and uſes a plain and forcible Argument to inſtruct them. Though the name of God be Sacred, and the moſt reverend appellation in the World, yet your law, ſays *Chriſt*, will allow it to them who ſpeak to you from him. If it be ſo then, and you cannot deny it, becauſe it is writen in your law, *Pſ.* 82. 6. *I have ſay'd ye are Gods.* If Men are ſometime allow'd to be call'd Gods, How much more may I make my ſelf God, and this without the leaſt danger of Blaſphemy, who am above any thing that

is created, to whom every Knee muſt bow of things in Heaven, and things in the Earth, and things under the Earth? *Whom the Father has ſanctify'd*, not only by a peculiar deſignation as a King, or a Prophet, but by an Eternal Communication of his nature by which *He and I are one*, and ſo ſent me into the World to ſave you and the reſt of Mankind. If I did not do the works which none but the Son of God can do, you might have ſome ground not to believe me. But as long as I do theſe miraculous works, it is to you a ſufficient argument of perſwaſion. You ought to believe *that the Father is in me and I in him*, v. 38.

That the Jews underſtood this anſwer litterally, as they had done the allegation, That they did not take it as an Apology for the pretended Blaſphemy, but a further proof of *his being one with the Father*, appears by their not relenting; but *v.* 39. *Therefore they ſought again to take him, but he eſcap't out of their hands.*

I beg leave then of this Author, and of *Calvin* whom he has cited, blaming the Fathers for miſapplying this Text, to ſay that the Fathers were in the right, and that nothing can be more obvious than this. It will be much confirm'd, if we conſider that this is not the only time that the Jews quarrell'd with *Chriſt* upon the ſame account; and he always anſwer'd, not by denying, but juſtifying the aſſertion. *Mark* 2. 5. He tells one who was brought to him Sick of the Palſy, *Thy ſins be forgiven thee*, *v.* 7. They preſently accuſe him of Blaſphemy, and that upon a known and undoubted principle *that none can forgive ſins but God.* He does not at all excuſe the thing, or make himſelf a deputed God, or a God by deputation, a ſort of God of theſe Gentlemens making. He grants that none but God can forgive ſins. Then he convinces them by a Miracle, and leaves them the concluſion to draw, Which is eaſier to cure, or to forgive? He that does

the

the one must be God, with an Article too, ὁ θεός: and he that does the other must be absolute Master of nature, and that is, God.

The Jews were so far perswaded that *Christ* by calling God his Father spoke of himself, not as of a Son by adoption, or any other title, but as a Son by nature co-equal and co-eternal, that they never understood him otherwise. This is as clear as the Sun, from *Joh.* 5. *Christ* cures a Man of an infirmity of 38. Years standing, *v.* 9. But it being on the Sabbath day, *v.* 16. The Jews persecuted him, and sought to slay him. He answers, *v.* 17. *My Father works hitherto, and I work.* They take from these words a new occasion to accuse him. At first they were only angry for his healing on the Sabbath, but now *v.* 18. *they sought the more to kill him ... because he said also that God was his Father. His own Father*, says the Evangelist, πατέρα ἴδιον, *making himself equal with God.* That Equality could not arise simply from calling God his Father. This was the privilege of the Jews, as it is now of Christians. But they made it to consist in this assertion, that as the Father was above the Sabbath, the Divine nature not being confin'd to those rules which it prescribes to us mortals; *Christ* saying the same of himself, He made himself the Son of God equal to his Father. Which equality of the Son with the Father the Jews suppose and acknowledge; But seek to kill him, because he pretended to assume it to himself. This the Fathers urg'd against the *Arrians.*

Now Christ replies without any variation, equivocation, or subterfuge. He is plain, and proves all along the Unity and sameness of nature with the Father. He says v. 19. that *he can do nothing of himself*, which does not imply weakness and insufficiency, as the Author of the Breif Hist. has abus'd that Text *pag.* 6. but shews only that he can act from no other principle but that by which he exists. That he has

his operation from him, from whom he has his being, and, as an infallible proof that this is the true sence of that place, he shews an extent of operation as great as the Father: *What things soever the Father does these does the Son likewise.* This is the Divinity of *Theodoret*, or, rather of *Alexander* Bishop of *Alexandria*, inserted in the first Book of his History. It is that of St. *Basil*, or the Author of the first Book *contr. Eunom.* and of the Generality of the Greek Fathers. It is that of St. *Hilary lib. 7. de Trin.* It is that of St. *Austin*, who *tract. 20. in Joann.* has these admirable words. "Whatsoever the Son has to do, he has from the Father the power to do it. Why, does he receive "from the Father the power to act, because he has "receiv'd of the Father to be his Son? He has his "power from the Father, because from the Father he "has his Essence.

Christ prosecutes the Argument and shews how God has communicated all things to him, even as a reward of his profound humiliation in taking our nature upon him, *v. 27. because he is the Son of Man.* But that, notwithstanding his outward appearance in infirmity and weakness, he has an Original and Eternal Being with the Father, *v. 26. As the Father has life in himself, so has he given the Son to have life in himself.* St. *Austin lib. 3. contra Maxim. c. 14.* "He has given "him the same life that he has. Such as he has it him-"self he has given it him; *He has given it as Infinite* "*as he has it in himself.* He concludes, *that all men should honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, the same honour being due to the same Divine Essence.

The sum of all is this. *Christ* does not at all grant that he is an inferior or a representative God, as these Gentlemen would have it, by the concession that some Men are call'd Gods; but concludes on the contrary, that if Men are not guilty of Blasphemy by taking that name; How much less is he who is, and on every occasion

caſion aſſerts himſelf to be the true God.

This takes off at once the Objections from all thoſe Texts which the Author of the Brief Hiſt. thought unanſwerable. *That he was faithful to him that made him*; that *we are Chriſt's and Chriſt is God's*. That *he humbl'd himſelf and became obedient*. That *the Son ſhall be ſubject to him, who put all things under him*. That *his doctrine is not his doctrine*. That *he intercedes with God for us*; and a great many more.

This Author lays a great weight on all thoſe Texts which prove the Humanity of Chriſt. His firſt Letter contains whatſoever the Evangeliſts have ſaid of the paſſions and infirmities of our Nature. We are ſo far from denying any part of this, that we think it the greateſt comfort Religion can give, that Chriſt was truly Man. We own it and Glory in it, that *Jeſus Chriſt* the Righteous our Advocate with the Father, was in all things like us, Sin only excepted. But the Scriptures of the Old and New Teſtament ſpeaking ſo fully to his Divinity with the Father in the communication of the ſame Nature and Eternal Being, lead us not to ſay that he is not God, becauſe he is Man, or that he is not Man, becauſe he is God: This is not to interpret, but to deſtory one Scripture by another. They lead us to take both the parts of the Myſtery as the ſpirit of God propoſes it, and to believe that he is *truly* God, and *truly* Man.

In ſhort, theſe Gentlemen can never ſatisify any Man's conſcience in this point, nor can they juſtifie themſelves to the Chriſtian Church from whoſe Faith they have departed; All that Wit and Eloquence which they are ſo much Maſters of, and all thoſe Arguments which they have treated with ſo much accuracy, being of no force againſt the proofs alledg'd. I will conclude this Letter of Chriſt's Pre-Eternity with this place of *Origen contr. Celſ. lib.* 6. This Father ſpeaks of the knowledge of

God, and how difficult it is to know him who has made darkneſs his Pavilion round about him. He ſays, that *the Father is known truly, and, κατ' ἀξίαν, only by the Word.* He proves this, by *Matt.* 11. 27. *Neither knows any man the Father, ſave the Son, and he to whomſoever the Son will reveal him. For none,* ſays he, *can know him truly, and as he deſerves to be known, who is begotten from all Eternity, and born before any created ſubſtance but the Father who has begot him. Nor can any know the Father after the ſame manner, but his living word, who is both his wiſdom and truth.*

I remain,

SIR,

Your humble, &c.

THE

THE Fourth LETTER.

SIR,

HAving prov'd the Pre-Exiſtence and Pre-Eternity of *Chriſt*, his Antemundane and Eternal Being with God, before he aſſum'd our Nature, and ſhew'd how deficient, or to uſe the very words of your Friends, in the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 23. how harſh and ſtrain'd their anſwers ſeem to be to the Texts produc't againſt them, it remains to make good that Chriſt is God by a communication of the Divine Eſſence, and that the Scriptures repreſent him to be God after a manner applicable to no Creature.

The firſt of theſe two aſſertions is grounded on *Phil.* 2. 6. and foll. *v.* The Apoſtle propoſes *Chriſt* to the *Philippians* as a Divine inſtance of Humility, and Obedience. He makes both to conſiſt in this, that being really God, and equal with God, yet he made himſelf of no reputation, but became Man, and humbl'd himſelf to the Death of the Croſs. The words of the Text are clearer than any Commentary. *v.* 6. *Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* The form of God is here the Nature and Eſſence of God; For though in ſome other places of Scripture, μορφὴ, *Form*, ſignifies no more than an Image, or a perſonal appearance, yet in this it is determin'd to this ſence of Nature and Eſſence by the next Verſe, where the form of a Servant is certainly the Nature and Eſſence of a Servant.

The

The word, ὑπάρχων, *subsisting*, rather than being in the form of God, as these Gentlemen will not deny that it should have been translated, implies a real and an actual in-being in the Divine Nature. St. *Paul* having asserted that *Christ* subsisted in the form of God, says, that *he thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, an expression which crumbles to dust the poor notion of a God by deputation, as *Socinus* has contriv'd, and an inferior though an excellent God, as *Arrius*. For what inferior or deputed God dares claim an equality with the God of Heaven and Earth? *audet pariari Deo*? says *Tertullian*. What *Moses*, *Solomon*, what Lord Lieutenant of a County, or Mayor of a Town, because the Scripture calls Magistrates Gods, would pretend it to be no robbery to equal themselves with God?

The excessive humility of Christ appears then in this, that though God, and equal with God, yet *v. 7. He made himself of no reputation, semetipsum exinanivit*, reads the Old Latin, *exhausted himself*, says *Tertullian contr. Marci.* more agreeable to the Original, *he lessen'd, he empty'd himself. He took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men*, both so Highly Disproportionate to the Infinite Being of God. *v. 8.* He carry'd yet the humiliation to a more stupendious degree; For *being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the Cross.* There is then not only a plain assertion but a visible Union of the two Natures. There is a God becoming a Servant, and a Man, and suffering for us in that humanity which he was pleas'd to assume.

The Author of the Brief History, *pag.* 37. excepts against this. He says *1st*, "That it cannot be the "design of the former part of these words to intimate "that *Christ* is God, because 'tis added at last, that "*God has exalted him, and given him a name that is a-*

"*bove*

" *bove every name.* These words plainly distinguish " *Christ* from God, as one who is not himself God, " but exalted by God. 2*ly*, That this has oblig'd several " judicious and learned *Trinitarians* to interpret the " whole Context of Christ, as he is a Man. 3*ly*, He explains *pag.* 38. *being in the form of God*, only to be like God by a communication of the Divine Power. 4*ly*, He does not translate as we do, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, but, committed not robbery to be equal with God, *i. e.* did not rob God of his honour by arrogating to himself to be God.

The Answerer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 36. and foll. says almost the same things; only he brings in a Tale, and a Proverb. The Tale is of a Countryman, who without a remnant of Greek or Latin, did yet puzzle his Vicar by asking, whether *It* was in the Original? whether the true reading was, *thought it not robbery*, or only *thought not robbery*; to which last the Vicar yielding, the Countryman was satisfy'd, that this Text did destroy the Divinity of *Christ*. The Proverb is, *that every like is not the same*, and therefore that since *Christ* was in the form of God, that is, like God, as *Adam*, and all other Men, he cannot be God. He says further, that it is both Morally and Physically impossible, that God should do any of these things, and undergo any of these changes. He observes, and that *Socinus* had done before, that if Christ is equal with God, he cannot be God, since nothing can be equal to it self. He cites *Christopher Sandius*, who has made a considerable Collection of Authors, Fathers, as well as modern, who confess, that this Text is to be understood of *Christ* as Man, and not as God.

The Answerer to two Discourses of one Monsieur *la Motté*, done out of French, repeats all this in other words: Only he is so confident that ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, must not be translated, *thought it not robbery*, that

that *pag.* 11. he ſends us to the School Boys, and *pag.* 8. to the *Lexicon.*

I hope they are Perſons of too much judgment to take this for an Anſwer, that *Chriſt* is not God, becauſe God has exalted him, and God cannot exalt God. For all that is, or ever was pretended from thence, is not that God has exalted God; But God has exalted that humane nature, that Man *Chriſt Jeſus*, aſſum'd by *the word*, to the participation of the honour due to God.

That other ſort of reaſoning is as bad as this; that if he is equal with God, He cannot be God, becauſe nothing can be equal to it ſelf. I ſuppoſe they mean, becauſe equality implies compariſon, and compariſon excludes identity. This is certainly falſe in Geometry, and falſe again in Divinity. But admitting the Propoſition as it lyes, It is nothing at all to the Queſtion. The deſign of the Apoſtle is not to compare *Chriſt* with God, or a God with another God. But only to ſhew, that *Chriſt* is that ſupreme God, who humbled himſelf to that degree as to take upon him the form of a Servant. Now what more ſignificant ſort of expreſſion could be us'd than this, that though he was God, and had reaſon to think all the perfections and glory of the Divine Nature to be his own, which is the full, and only importance of being equal with God, yet he humbl'd himſelf to death, &c.

I hope alſo, that they are not in earneſt, when they bring *Sandius* with his Catalogue of moſt Learned and Judicious *Trinitarians*; ſince they cannot be ignorant that *All* the Greek Fathers concern'd in this diſpute, who underſtood I hope their own language better than any of us, It being more than highly probable that the Author of the Brief Hiſtory, and of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn*, who are really accurate Writers, can give a far better account of any Engliſh Phraſe now in uſe, and better underſtand the

extent

extent and importance of it, than a *Frenchman* or a *Dutchman*, who though never ſo Learned, and Judicious, will twelve or thirteen hundred Years hence Criticiſe, Paraphraſe, and give another ſence to that Phraſe than what they gave themſelves; ſince I ſay all the Greek Fathers, who underſtood the force of ἐν ἁρπαγμῷ ἡγήσατο, thought theſe words an undoubted and clear teſtimony of *Chriſt's* Divinity.

The natural impoſſibility of the thing is an old objection made to *Lactantius*, and confuted by that Father. *Negant Deo dignum ut Homo fieri vellet .... ut paſſionibus, ut doloribus ſeſe ipſe ſubjiceret. They deny that it is worthy of God to become man, and ſubject himſelf to Grief, and Sufferings.* This is the conſtant mothod of theſe Gentlemen always to return to the *How can it be?* It is not ſo, becauſe it is impoſſible. We ſay it is poſſible becauſe it is ſo, and it is ſo becauſe it is reveal'd. It is diſingenuous to be ever parting from the point in Queſtion which is the Revelation, to the manner of the thing it ſelf which is above our reach. All theſe things conſider'd which really are not worth anſwering, may not I have the liberty to tell your Friends what they ſaid to Monſieur *la Motté*, *pag.* 16. "T'is a very thin Sophiſtry, this; when an Author "leaves off to ſpeak to the vulgar, and would needs "undertake in this very paſſage, *Phil.* 2. 6, 7, 8. to "ſpeak to the learned, he ſhould bring ſomething "more ſubſtantial to blind ſuch Eyes as theirs.

In ſhort, the ſtreſs of the difficulty lies here. Whether to be in the form of God, μορφὴ θεοῦ, Signifies the nature, or only the likeneſs of God, ſuch as *Adam*, and all other Men have? And whether the Tranſlation is right, *thought it not robbery to be equal with God.* That the form of God is the Divine Eſſence is evinc't from the Authority of the Greek Fathers, *Theodoret*, *Baſil*, St. *Chryſoſtom*, *Theophilact*, who not only

only ſpoke their own language, but were Men of an admirable Eloquence and purity of ſpeech; And indeed if we conſider the force of the word ὑπάρχων, *ſubſiſting*, it cannot be otherwiſe. It is againſt all the rules of Philoſophy, of ſence, of Speech, if form is no more than an accidental form, to uſe the word *ſubſiſting*, which implies of it ſelf a communication, participation, or in-being in the ſame nature. To ſay that a Man ſubſiſts in the form of a Man, is not to ſay that he is like other Men, or has the figure of a Man, but that he is really a Man, that he has human nature communicated to him.

To pretend that the form of God is only a communication of a Divine power of miracles, &c. If this flows from a communication of Eſſence, as *Matt.* 28. 18. *All power is given me in Heaven and in earth.* Joh. 14. 10. *The Father that dwells in me he does the works.* Act. 2. 22. *Jeſus of Nazareth a man approv'd of God amongſt you by miracles .... which God did by him in the midſt of you*, is a notion tolerable, though very improper. But if it is only a communication of a power foreign to us, to which we have no relation, and in which we are only inſtrumental, ſuch as was in *Moſes*, in the Prophets, and Apoſtles, is a ridiculous notion. To ſubſiſt in a miraculous power, that is, to be a miraculous power, is an irrational and unintelligible way of ſpeaking. The Great *Eraſmus* then, and the Illuſtrious *Grotius* from whom they have borrow'd this Explication, are greatly and Illuſtriouſly miſtaken. To deal with candor, I humbly beg what ſence can be made of this? "Let this mind "be in you which was in *Chriſt Jeſus*, who being in "the form of God, a Man made in the ſimilitude of "God as other Men are, yet became Man for your "ſakes.

To ſay that *Chriſt* making himſelf of no reputation was the concealing of his Miracles, as theſe Gentlemen

men interpret it, is unreasonable and contrary to the Gospel. His miraculous Birth of a Virgin, his Star in the East, his being reveal'd to the Shepherds by the Angels, his being Preach't by the Baptist, God owning him for his Son, his doing good amongst all Men, his miraculous works, the raising of *Lazarus*, The prodigious Eclipse at his Death, the continual attendance of the multitudes upon him made him the most famous Person in the World. The Gospel wholly contradicts the injurious assertion, *Matt.* 4. 24. *Matt.* 9. 31. and 14. 1. *Luk.* 1. 15. *Mark.* 1. 28.

That *thought it not robbery to be equal with God*, is truly translated, I have this to Offer: 1*st*, That the Generality of the Latin Fathers render'd it thus, and that no exception was made against it by the *Arrians*, to whom they produc't this Text. 2*ly*, That all the publick, Authentick, and receiv'd translations read it as we do. 3*ly*, That the *It* which this sharp-nos'd Countryman smelt to be wanting in the Text, adds nothing to its force; and that *thought no robbery*, is as home to the question, as *thought it not robbery*, since the natural sence of the words, the very first impression which they naturally give, is that *Christ* did not think to be a Robber, Guilty of Theft and Injustice in equalling himself to God. The other being strain'd, a sence of yesterday and invented in these latter times to serve a turn. 4*ly*, That the first part of the Verse, *who subsisting in the form of God*, makes that sence impossible, for if he subsisted in the form, or nature of God, how could he who was God, arrogate to himself to be God? 5*ly*, That the translation of these Gentlemen, *committed not robbery by equalling himself with God*, is a most notorious falsification of a Text. I will not send them to School Boys and Lexicons to know the sence of ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ. Civility and Breeding must never be Banish't from the hottest disputes. I will only say, *en passant*, that Learned men

men use to Correct Lexicons and Dictionaries, and not to be corrected by them. But I appeal to themselves, and beg of them to know, 1*st*, Whether ἁρπαγμὸς, does not signify all the World over, *Robbery?* And ἡγήσατο, thought, judg'd, counted, and therefore whether thought not, counted not robbery to be equal with God is not an exact Translation. 2*ly*, I beg that they would produce any one Greek Author either Sacred or profane who renders ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο to commit robbery. I pass by that other strange stroke, of rendring *to be equal with God*, by *equalling himself with God.*

Thus you see, Sir, your Friends are so taken up with their new Creation, that they assume to themselves a power to create a new sence to some words, a sence which they never had, nor can never have.

Coloss. 2. 9. The Apostle has asserted this Sacred truth in few words but comprehensive, *v.* 3. *In him*, Christ, *are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.* *v.* 7. The *Colossians* are to be *rooted, and built up in him.* *v.* 8. Philosophy will rather deceive than inform them. The traditions of men and the Elements of the World, whether the weak notices of the Gentiles, or the observances of the Jewish Oeconomy are all insufficient. None but Christ can supply their wants, and make them truly knowing and good. St. *Paul* gives this reason for it, *For in him dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.*

Our translation comes short of the energy of the Greek Text, which should have been render'd thus; *For in him dwells the whole fulness of the Godhead Essentially*, a notion of the word σωματικῶς, usual in the Scriptures. This proves then all that the several sorts of Hereticks have deny'd of *Christ*. A Communication not of power or Vertue, as in *Moses* or the *Prophets*, but of nature, θείας, of the Divine Nature. A Communication not Figurative, Sacramental, or representative, but real and substantial.

ſubſtantial. A Communication not partial, tranſient, or begun in time, but the whole nature, the whole fullneſs of the Godhead. A Communication ſuppoſing a diſtinction of Perſons againſt the *Sabellians*, him who communicates, and him to whom it is communicated, *Col.* 1. 19. *For it pleas'd the Father that in him the whole fullneſs ſhould dwell.* A Communication which clearly ſhews againſt *Arrians*, *Neſtorians*, *Socinians*, the Hypoſtatical Union of the two natures in Chriſt. For it is in him, ἐν αὐτῷ, in his adorable Perſon, in *Chriſt the word made Fleſh*, that this Divine Nature dwells, with all the Properties, Attributes, Qualifications which belong to it; All human apprehenſions and expreſſions being infinitely ſhort of this inſpir'd way of ſpeaking of St. *Paul*, *all the fullneſs of the Godhead bodily.*

To this the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 39. anſwers ſomewhat confuſedly contrary to his Cuſtom. He ſays, that the fulneſs of the Godhead is the fulneſs of the knowledge of God, which he pretends to prove, by *Eph.* 3. 19. where the Apoſtle wiſhes *that they may be fill'd with all the fullneſs of God.* This *Chriſt* had, and he has fill'd us Chriſtians with it. He ſays that this knowledge dwelt in him *bodily*, in oppoſition to that imperfect, umbratile, and unſincere knowledge of God, which the Apoſtle affirms, *v.* 8. to be found in the Philoſophy and Philoſophers of *Greece*, who in St. *Paul's* time were in great Eſteem amongſt the *Coloſſians.* He adds that this is the Interpretation of the moſt Learned and Orthodox Interpreters.

It is true that ſome Interpreters, whom theſe Gentlemen always honour with the Title of moſt learned, if they but ſpeak what pleaſes them; have oppos'd theſe words, not only to the Philoſophy of the Greeks, but even to the law which was only *a ſhadow of things to come*, *Chriſt* being the Body, as the *Syriack* reads the 17. *v.* the ſubſtance and perfection of knowledge, and there being as much difference between

their Doctrine and his, as there is between the ſhadow and the body. But two things this Author has not taken notice of; 1*ſt*, That theſe moſt Learned Interpreters do only deliver this as a ſecondary interpretation, leaving the Primary, which I have laid before you, in its full force. 2*ly*, That this Interpretation really ſuppoſes and reſolves it ſelf into the firſt. The Apoſtle deſires the *Coloſſians* to avoid the vain Philoſophy of the Greeks, that ſcience falſly ſo call'd, and the rudiments of the World, thoſe imperfect ways of men's invention to bring and reconcile them to God; even all the Ceremonial Law, which though preſcrib'd by God himſelf, yet was only in order to ſomewhat better; and that they ſhould ſtick to *Chriſt*, be rooted, and built up in him, in whom and by whom they ſhould be fill'd and compleated. He gives the reaſon of this, becauſe *in him are hid the treaſures of wiſdom and knowledge*; and he is the head of all Principality, and Power; and all this is true, becauſe he is not only a wiſe and a rational Man according to the World, for ſuch were the Philoſophers; Nor a Man ſent from God, for ſuch were *Moſes* and the Prophets, but he was God himſelf come down in our Fleſh, *for in him dwells the whole fullneſs of the Godhead bodily*, Subſtantially, Eſſentially.

I am ſatisfy'd that this Author does not believe the application of *Eph.* 3. 19. to have any ſolidity. But there is in the diſputed Text *the fullneſs of the Godhead*, and in this *the fullneſs of God*. Theſe two words are alike, and therefore muſt be made to jump. When he cannot but know that all the Interpreters, even the beloved *Eraſmus*, and *Grotius*, tell us that the Apoſtle means no more by this, than that *Chriſt* may dwell in our hearts by Faith, and that we may have as much of the favour and grace of God as we can.

I beg to know with what candor he has tranſla-

ted

ted θεὸς by θεότης, God by the Deity, or The Divine Nature, which though sometimes Synonymous, yet cannot be so here.

But what can more effectually prove the communication of the Divine Nature to *Christ*, than that he is the only begotten Son of God, *Joh.* 1. 18. *No man has seen God at any time, the only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, he has declar'd him.* A title peculiar to *Christ*, and expressive of all that can be conceiv'd of him, his Consubstantiality, his Co-Eternity, his Equality with the Father.

These Gentlemen think it a very strong Argument that *Christ* is not God, because in the Apostolical Creed, the unchangeable rule of our Faith, the first Article gives the name of God only to the Father, *I believe in God The Father*, and the second does not say, *and in God the Son*, but *and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord*; not considering that the word *only Son*, the same with *only begotten* here, is a fuller expression of his Divinity than if the name God had been given him in the Article. For this would not have satisfy'd these Gentlemen. They would have been apt to say still that the first Article is spoken of him who is only and eminently God, and the second, or third of a God by deputation, of one not truly God, but only honour'd with the title of God. This would not have remov'd the objection, nor prevented that of the *Tritheists*, who seeing every Person in the Creed nam'd, God, would have concluded not a Trinity of Persons in one God, but Three real Gods. Whereas the All-wise God has effectually obviated this, by proposing the Divine Nature to our belief, *I believe in God*, in which Three Persons subsist: The Father who is Maker of Heaven and Earth, His only Son who is our Lord, and the Holy Spirit who Sanctifies the Catholick Church.

This expression *the only Son*, or the only begotten,

is a ſtop to all thoſe exceptions. For he cannot be a deputed God who is a Son, an only Son, begotten, as the Fathers and Councils expreſs it, of the ſubſtance of the Father. He muſt be God of God, very God of very God. The Eternal God of the Eternal God. This ſuppos'd, there is no objection can be pretended. God cannot have a Son but it muſt be by a communication of his ſubſtance. An Eternal being cannot communicate it ſelf, as we mortals do, within the meaſures and ſucceſſions of time. A mortal begets another mortal; He can give no other ſubſtance then what he has. An Eternal being gives what he is himſelf, an Eternal and Divine being. This leads to the true ſence of *Col.* 1. 15. 2. *Cor.* 4. 4. *Heb.* 1. 3. where *Chriſt* is call'd *the image of God*, *the brightneſs of his glory*, *the expreſs image of his Perſon*. Texts ſo reverenc't by the Fathers of the Chriſtian Church, and ſo abus'd by *Socinus* and the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 38. who ſays, "That thoſe Texts are demonſtrations that Chriſt is not God, it being ſimply "impoſſible that the image ſhould be the very being, or "thing whoſe image it is. Were this reaſoning true, which is a meer Sophiſm to reaſon of an Eternal and Increated Being, by the rules of things mortal and created, it can reach to no more than this, that the Son is not the Father, becauſe he is the expreſs Image of his Perſon, which is true; but at the ſame time it proves, that becauſe he is his Image, he muſt have a communication of his ſubſtance, becauſe he is his only Image, as he is his only begotten Son.

But ſay theſe Gentlemen, you run on, but ſtill you ſuppoſe the thing to be prov'd. We agree that Chriſt is the only Son our Lord: but we deny that the only begotten implies a communication of ſubſtance. *Chriſt*, ſays the Authour of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 28. "is call'd the only begotten, on ſeveral accounts. "This eſpecially, that he only was begotten by the

"Divine

"Divine Power on a Woman. He is the only begotten, "ſays *Chrellius*, becauſe of all the Sons of God he is the "beſt, and moſt dear to him.

Time is too precious to ſpend it in anſwering ſuch things as theſe are. The Interpretation of *Chrellius* is trifling; and that of the Brief Hiſt. is abſurd. God is a Father antecedently to the Creation of the World. God is not the Father of *Chriſt*, but as he is the Father of *the word* who aſſum'd our nature. Had there been nothing created, there would have been ſtill a Father, and Father of it ſelf ſuppoſes a Son. If the Father is from ever, the Son is from ever. Theſe ancient aſſertions of the Primitive Fathers deſtroy the notion of theſe Gentlemen of *the only begotten*. A notion ſo ſtrange, ſo new, ſo contrary to the language of Scripture, and to that of the Church, that the Old Hereticks durſt never offer at it.

It ruines the difference between *Chriſt* and the reſt of men. For we are all the Sons of God. Nay, we can no more be the Sons of God, being only Sons of God by adoption, and only adopted in *Chriſt Jeſus*, who if he is adopted himſelf, and only a Coheir with us, as we are Coheirs with him, there is no more adoption, the great bleſſing of Chriſtianity. Now if *Chriſt* is the only begotten of the Father, by reaſon of his being conceiv'd of a Woman by the Divine Power, it is viſible that he is no more than an adopted Son as we are. This ſecond *Adam* has no more of the Divine Nature than the firſt, who was made of the Earth by the Divine power, as the other was made of a Woman, and was only an adpoted Son. Whereas the Scripture is ſo careful to diſtinguiſh between us the adopted Sons, and that Son who is not adopted; and is call'd *the true Son, the only Son, his own Son, his only begotten Son, that Son who is ſent, Gal.* 4. 4. *that we might receive the adoption of Sons.*

It offers violence to theſe Texts, to which the Au-

thor of the Brief Hiſt. has done the advantage to ſhew that they are proofs againſt all the Turns of Wit, *Joh.* 10. 30. *I and my Father are one.* Joh. 7. 29. *I know him, for I am from him.* Joh. 10. 38. *The Father is in me, and I in him: I came out from the Father*; and to all the unanimous confeſſions in *the Goſpel, Thou are the Chriſt the Son of the living God.*

I commend this Author to have in this place given an anſwer without a reaſon to ſupport it. He has in this as in other places evaded and ſhifted the difficulty. He ſees what ſtraights his Explication of the only begotten is lyable to, and too much modeſty to have laid down the pretended reaſons of his Friends. They would put a ſober Philoſopher to the bluſh. I cannot without Horror read *Smalcius de veto & natur. dei fil.* And all that can be ſaid to this, is what St. *Auſtin* ſaid almoſt on the ſame account, that it is *Scelerati ſſima opinio, a moſt execrable opinion. Serm.* 191. *de temp.*

I will multiply no more Arguments on this ſubject, the places alledg'd being ſo full and forcible, and the ſhifts of theſe Gentlemen ſo viſible, that it is enough to perſwade any equitable perſon. I paſs to the ſecond part of the aſſertion, that the name of God is given to the Saviour after a manner applicable to no creature. I will not lay down the rules which the *Socinians* have invented to diſcern when the word *God* muſt be underſtood of that God who is ſo by nature, and of the deputed God, who is only ſo by Office. They are Criticiſms for the moſt part falſe, and always little and uncertain.

I humbly conceive that, 1 *Tim.* 3. 16. is ſpoken of the God by nature. *And without controverſy great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, juſtify'd in the ſpirit, ſeen of Angels, preach't to the Gentiles, believ'd on in the world, receiv'd up into Glory.* I humbly conceive alſo that every word of this is accompliſh't in *Chriſt Jeſus*, and that this Text

is

is an Epitome of the Goſpel. *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, is the explication of *Joh.* 1. 1. *and the word was made Fleſh. Juſtify'd in the ſpirit*, is the explication of *Matt.* 3. 16, 17. *and lo the Heavens were open'd, and the ſpirit of God deſcending . . . and lo a voice from Heaven, this is my beloved Son. Seen of Angels*, is the explication of *Matt.* 4. 11. *and behold Angels came and Miniſter'd to him. Preach't to the Gentiles*; is the explication of *Matt.* 28. 18. *Teach all nations. Believ'd on in the World*, is the explication of *Joh.* 6. 69. and many places of this nature. *Receiv'd up into Glory*, is the Explication of *Mark* 16. 19. *He was receiv'd up into Heaven.* This Text is expreſs for the Incarnation, and the Union of the two Natures. A Myſtery truly great and incomprehenſible, God made Man! An admirable inſtance of the love of God to us, and a moſt powerfull motive of our Obedience to him.

Theſe Gentlemen have made two ſorts of Objections to this. The one they have taken from *Chellius* and their other profeſs't Friends, the other from *Eraſmus* and *Grotius*. For the *1ſt*, the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 40. ſays, "That if we will make ſence of "this Text, we muſt tranſlate, *Great is the Myſtery of "Godlineſs*, *God was manifeſted by Fleſh*, *i. e.* God's "nature and will was manifeſted by Fleſh; that is, "by Man, by *Jeſus Chriſt* and his Apoſtles to us "Gentiles. *Was juſtify'd in the ſpirit*, *i. e.* the ſame "will and nature of God was verify'd by miracles "done by the ſpirit or power of God. *Was ſeen of "Angels*, *i. e.* was known to the Angels who were "deſirous to underſtand this new revelation. *Believ'd "on in the world*, receiv'd with Glory, or Glorioufly, "and not *receiv'd up into Glory*. The Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn*, ſays, "That by *God* "we may underſtand here, as in divers other Texts "the Trinitarians themſelves do, not the Perſon, but "the will and mind of God. This was manifeſted to

" us *by Fleſh*, that is by *Chriſt* and his Apoſtles. They " have as much reaſon to tranſlate *by* inſtead of *in* " *Fleſh*, as we have to tranſlate *by the ſpirit*, inſtead of, " *in the ſpirit*. It ought not to be tranſlated *receiv'd up* " *into Glory*, but *receiv'd gloriouſly*, *i. e.* extoll'd, magni- " fy'd, lifted up. He gives this reaſon for underſtanding the word *God* not of God himſelf, but of his will and mind, that we interpret it thus, *Gal.* 1. 10. *do I now perſwade men or God?* Do I ſeek to perſwade human invention ..... or the very will and commands of God?

Thus ſilly and bold Criticiſms are made uſe of to undermine the Chriſtian Faith. The poverty of this new tranſlation will be evident from this very obſervation, that *God* to expreſs the mind and the will of God is a dialect which they may have us'd themſelves to, but is wholly unknown and unpractis'd in Scripture. They are deſir'd to give any one ſingle inſtance of it, but clear, plain, and lyable to no exception. *Gal.* 1. 10. is far from being of that nature. *Men*, do not ſignify there human inventions, nor *God*, the will and commands of God. The Generality of Interpreters and indeed the nature of the thing it ſelf leading us to this ſence of the place: *Do I ſeek to approve my ſelf to men, or to God? ..... For if yet I pleas'd men, I ſhould not be the Servant of Chriſt.*

Their tranſlating ἐν σαρκὶ, *by Fleſh*, is contrary to the original, to the Faith of all tranſlations, and to the ſence of Mankind. The reaſon which they give for it, that we tranſlate ἐν πνεύματι *by the ſpirit*, is wholly falſe. But the laſt part of this Text, *receiv'd gloriouſly*, that is, as they ſay, extoll'd, magnify'd, and not *receiv'd up into glory*, is an inſufferable attempt on the Eyes and ſence of men. They ſhould have imitated *Eraſmus*, who having ſtrain'd as much as poſſible every part of this Text, was ſo ſtruck with the evidence of this laſt expreſſion, that though a great Wit and a great Critick he thought it the beſt way to let it alone and

ſay

ſay nothing to it. He ſaw clearly that *the will and mind of God* taken up to Heaven is a barbarous way of expreſſion. He was ſenſible that ἀνάλημψις in the dialect of the Scripture, *Mark* 16.19. *Act.* 1.11. *Act.* 1. 22. is an actual, real, perſonal being taken up of *Chriſt* into Heaven. He knew that this is the language of both the Teſtaments, and that the ſame is us'd of *Enoch*, of *Moſes* and of *Elias*.

The firſt part then of their anſwer is not ſolid, and if they had no more to ſay than this they muſt be look't upon as unreaſonable and obſtinate men. Indeed the Author of the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn* has made a pretty paraphraſe, and very intelligible. It has only that unhappineſs that he has given us his ſence and not the ſence of the Apoſtle, and abſolutely departed from the truth and meaning of the Text, which a Paraphraſt ought not to do. It is very diverting to read theſe Gentlemen's Paraphraſes: They make what words they will, and give them what ſence they pleaſe: Then they muſter all up, and end in a pretty Speech.

What they have borrow'd of *Grotius* conſiſts in this, "That the word *God* is not in the Text. Brief "Hiſt. *pag.* 44. This appears by the *Syriack*, *Latin*, "*Ethiopick*, *Armenian*, *Arabick*, and moſt ancient "Greek Bibles, by great many citations out of the "Greek and Latin Fathers, who read not *God was* "*manifeſted*, but *which was manifeſted*. *Macedonius* "was the firſt who corrupted this Text, by ſub-"ſtituting the word *God*, inſtead of the word *which*, "and for this and other matters he was depos'd by "the Emperour *Anaſtaſius*, about the Year 512. The Anſwerer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 2, & 3. ſays, "That "the *Latin*, *Syriack*, and *Armenian* Tranſlations, the "Council of *Nice*, and St. *Jerom* himſelf, a bigotted "Trinitarian, read *which*, and not *God*. *Eraſmus* "ſays, that *Multa vetera exemplaria*, many (but not

"very

"very many, as the anſwerer has tranſlated it) of "the ancient Copies read *which*, a reading approv'd "by *Eraſmus* himſelf. *Grotius* cites *Hincmarus* Arch- "biſhop of *Rhemes*, ſaying that the *Neſtorians* ſub- "ſtituted *God* in the room of *which*, the better to "defend themſelves from the *Eutychians*. *Liberatus* "the Archdeacon of *Carthage* aſſures us, that *Maceda-* "*nius* was depos'd for ſo doing. This, and ſome heats againſt Mr. *Milbourn*, is the ſum of what he has to ſay.

What *Eraſmus* ſays of his many, or as this Author will have it, very many ancient Greek Copies that read *which* and not *God*, with the leave of that great Man, is a real miſtake. *Beza* examining himſelf this very place of *Eraſmus*, anſwers plainly, *Verum repugnant perpetuo conſenſu omnes Græci codices. But All the Greek Copies with an univerſal conſent give him the lye. All the Greek Copies do agree in the word God*, ſays one of the beſt and moſt learned Prelates this Nation ever had. *The joint conſent*, ſays he in another place, *of the Greek Copies and Interpreters are above the Authority of theſe two Tranſlations*; He means the *Latin* and *Syriack*.

But to examine this moſt particularly; *Grotius* does not condemn, or reject, but only inſinuates that he has ſome cauſe to ſuſpect the reading, *God*. The *Latin* Interpreter as the moſt ancient is the great objection, for all the reſt, *Armenian*, *Ethiopick*, *Arabick*, are names ſerve only to fill the Page, and make the ſimple Reader to ſtare. But it will prove at laſt no Objection. For if a thouſand Tranſlations read contrary to the Original Text, we ought not to depart from it, if the Text is true, genuine, and indiſputable. But it is not ſo, replies the Author. *Grotius* affirms, that *Hincmarus*, a Prelate ſo famous in his time, is poſitive, that the word *God* was thruſt into the Text by the *Neſtorians*, and in particular by *Macedonius*, who

who corrupted the ſincere reading of that very place.

I never ſaw either Mr. *Milbourn*, or his Book, but he might have told his Anſwerer that *Grotius* is ſtrangely miſtaken, and ſo muſt the Learned Prelate be whom he has cited. All the World cannot make me apprehend how the *Neſtorians* ſhould thruſt the word, *God*, into a Text by which they ruin'd themſelves and their Doctrines to all intents and purpoſes. *Neſtorius*, ſays this very Author in his Anſwer to the late Archbiſhop, *pag.* 61. ſaid, "That God was not "Hypoſtatically united, or after the manner of a Per"ſon, to the Man *Chriſt Jeſus*. But only dwelt in him by "a more plentiful effuſion, or exertion of the Divine "Preſence and Attributes, than in former Prophets. "This led him to ſay, that our Saviour ought to be "call'd *Chriſt*, and not *God*. He deny'd that he could "call him God, *&c.* I ask then, How it can be conceiv'd, that it ſhould come into the head of the *Neſtorians*, to change the Particle ὃ *which*, the only thing that could favour their Doctrine, into θεὸς, *God*, the only word that could ruine it. Is it rational to think, that a Sect of men who are profeſſedly bent againſt the Incarnation of *Chriſt*, ſhall alter a plain Text to put in a word which will make it undiſputable? Will it be believ'd in the next Age, if *Socinianiſm* is ſo long liv'd, that the Socinians would alter a Text which does not prove the Divinity of *Chriſt*, and add words to it, by which it may clearly be prov'd?

It is a great miſtake to ſay that *Macedonius* was turn'd out of the Sea of *Conſtantinople* for falſifying this Text. It is true that *Anaſtaſius* turn'd him out, but it does not appear that it was upon any ſuch account. That that makes this to be undeniable is, that this Text is read by the Fathers with the word *God*, before *Macedonius* was born, and even long before the Hereſy of *Neſtorius*. St. *Chryſoſtom* Patriarch himſelf

ſelf of *Conſtantinople* long before *Neſtorius* reads in this place *God was manifeſted*, &c. So does *Theodoret*, ſo does St. *Cyril*, even againſt this very *Neſtorius*, ſo do ſeveral other Fathers, too tedious to inſert. I will add, that whoever reads attentively the place of *Hincmarus* which theſe Gentlemen have not cited, but is *Opuſc.* 55. *cap.* 18. *& Liberatus cap.* 19. and he will find even in their own account the addition of the word *God* to have been impoſſible.

Another Objection is that of the Council of *Nice*, of next Authority with us, ſays the Author, and with a great deal of truth, to the ſacred Scriptures. "One having repeated this Text with the word *God* "taken probably out of ſome Marginal note, where "he found the word *God*, put as an Explanation "of the word, *which* in the Text, was anſwer'd by "*Macarius* Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, that he miſtook the "reading, the words being *which was manifeſted in the* "*fleſh*. This makes nothing againſt us. It proves that this reading was ancienter than the Council of *Nice*. It proves, if the Author's wild conjecture may be admitted, that if there was even any Copy where the word *God* was not, that the *which* by the force of the following parts of the Verſe, and the ſence of that age having put to it that marginal note, was to be underſtood of God. It proves that the *Arrians* had begun early to corrupt thoſe Texts which were plaineſt for the Divinity of *Chriſt*. Had this Author ſhew'd, that upon this allegation of *Macarius*, the ſacred Council had rejected this Text, it would have been of ſome weight; but the miſtake of that Biſhop appears by the unanimous conſent of the Greek Fathers uſing this Text with the word *God*, in the time of, and after the Council.

But even in the Latin Church where the Interpreter reads *which*, The Fathers underſtood that Myſtery, which the Apoſtle calls *confeſſedly ſo great*, of the Incarnation

carnation of *Jesus Christ*. Nor is the *assumptum est in gloria*, of the vulgar Latin, *taken up into Glory*, capable of any other sence. These Gentlemen have a great disadvantage, that when they have never so finely shap't an interpretation, and put it in never so pretty a dress, not only the new but also the old Christian World rises against it. It was the wish no doubt of a good Man, that his Soul might rest with the Philosophers. Let mine rest with the Primitive Fathers, and Councils of the Church. In all Arts and Sciences, the further we go, the greater are our improvements, But in the case of Religion, the nearer we return to the Spring, the more purity and truth we meet with.

Rom. 9. 5. is another staring Text. *Whose are the Fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all God blessed for ever*, Amen. That the title of blessed over all for ever is only due, and was only given to the Almighty, is evident from the Old and New Testament, and the constant practices of Jews and Christians. If the word, *God*, was not in this Text it would lose nothing of its force; *The blessed over all* implying with all the Jewish Doctors that Essential Happiness, that Absolute Dominion, that Incomprehensible Greatness which belong to none but him who is God by nature. But since all this is said of *Christ* in plain and express words, the consequence is easy, he must be that God. Should all Mankind conspire to find words clear and positive to represent the two natures, *and God made Man*, they must come short of this Apostle, who shews the one in this part of the Text, *of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ came*, and the other in that, *who is over all God blessed for ever*. *Proclus* in his Book *de fid.* looks on this Text alone, as a confutation of all the Heresies concerning *Christ*. *Athanasius* and the Catholick Fathers urg'd it with vehemence against the Arrians. *Theophilus* the

great Admirer, and even the Transcriber of St. *Chrysostom*, says in this place, that St. *Paul* by Proclaiming *Christ God over all*, has publisht the shame of *Arius* who deny'd it, to all the World.

The Author of the Brief Hist. *pag.* 35. says to this 1*st*, "That it is very probable by the *Syriack*, and "some passages in *Ignatius*, and other Fathers, that "the word, *God*, was not originally in this Text. For "they read it without. 2*ly*, Admitting the reading "in the vulgar Editions of the Greek, *Erasmus* and "*Curcellæus* observe that it should have been thus "translated; *Of whom as concerning the Flesh Christ "came; God who is over all* be *blessed for ever.* 3*ly*, That "these words, according to the Flesh, or concerning "the Flesh, never signify according to his human na-"ture, as if he had also a Divine Nature, *Rom.* 9. 3. "*My Kinsman according to the Flesh*, Rom. 4. 1. *Abra-"ham our Father as pertaining to the Flesh.* Coloss. 3. "22. *Servants obey in all things your Masters according "to the Flesh.* Which places do not suppose that they "had a Divine Nature, but only mean that *Abraham* "is the Father of the Jews, according to their Bodies, "as God is the Father of their Souls and Spirits. "Therefore the meaning can only be, that according "to the body, *Christ* descended from *Abraham* and "*David.*

This last part of the Answer is perfectly *Socinian.* The second he has borrow'd of *Erasmus*, and the first of *Grotius.* The Author of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn* says the same things. He adds, "That Mr. *Mil-"bourn* might have taken notice out of *Grotius*, that "the Greek Copies us'd by the Author of the Syriack "had not the word *God.* They only say *the blessed over "all.* That the same Illustrious Interpreter observes "that *Erasmus* had noted, that the Copies of St. *Cy-"prian*, *Chrysostom*, *Hilary*, had only, *the Blessed over "all*, without the word *God.* Then the Answerer

grows angry. These are, says he, "Observations "which destroy our Author's Arguments from this "Text. But, because he knew not what to say to "them, he took no notice of them. It is an impious "thing for a Writer to endeavour to cheat his Reader "in such questions as these. When it appears by such "great Authorities, that the ancient reading was "otherwise, or various, or uncertain; how can "such Texts be admitted as proofs in so great a que-"stion as this?

At last he gives the reason why *Erasmus* has made a Translation contrary to all the Translations in the World, because he observes, that if the words *God over all*, had been intended of *Christ*, the Apostle should have said ὁς ὢν, not ὁ ὤν. I doubt not, says he, that our Author was aware that those Criticks were in the right, and therefore he willingly over-look't both the Translation and the reason of it. Thus far this Author, *pag.* 34. 35. of his Answer. This is indeed very severe, and much exceeding the bounds of common civility; but strangely barbarous, if all this is made to appear to be trifling and inconsiderable.

1*st*, This Gentlemen who chid Mr. *Milbourn* for not taking notice out of the Illustrious *Grotius*, that the word *God* is not in the *Syriack*, should not have trusted *Grotius*, who is really mistaken in this; but should have gone to the Syraick it self, and there would have found the word, *God*. He should have seen also that he was deceiv'd by *Grotius*, as *Grotius* was by *Erasmus*, an Illustrious Person often deceiving another, about St. *Cyprian*, St. *Chrysostom*, and St. *Hilary*. For several Copies of St. *Cyprian* read the word, *God*. And that that demonstrates beyond the possibility of denyal, that if it is not in some Copies, it must have been the fault of the Transcriber, is this, that St. *Cyprian* makes use of this Text, *lib.* 2. *adv.*

adv. Jud. and brings into the Catalogue of those Texts which call *Christ God.* He had it from *Tertullian* disputing against *Praxeas* and alledging this Text twice; a thing ordinary to St. *Cyprian*, who us'd to call the learned *African* his Master. This shews by the way, how these Gentlemen can assure that the *Antenicene* Fathers did not believe *Christ* to be God. *Erasmus* has also mistaken St. *Chrysostom*, who is so far from reading, the *blessed over all*, without, *God*, that in his Exposition he reads neither the one nor the other, but both when he cites this Text. But for St. *Hilary*, I am amaz'd to hear his Authority disputed who has not only cited this Text with the words, *God blessed over all*, but added an Explication to it, which is levell'd against the very Soul of *Socinianism*, the beloved notion of a deputed, or of a made God. *Non ignorat Paulus Christum Deum, dicens, quorum sunt Patres, & ex quibus Christus qui est super omnia Deus. Non hic Creatura in Deum deputatur, sed Creaturarum Deus est qui super omnia Deus. Paul is not ignorant that Christ is God, who says, whose are the Fathers, and of whom Christ came who is God over all. Here a Creature is not a deputed God, but he is the God of Creatures, who is God over all.* Hil. de Trin.

The Author of the Brief Hist. was sensible of this, and modestly declin'd the naming of these Fathers. But how could Mr. *Milbourn's* Adversary so severely reflect upon him when he himself was certainly in the wrong? May I speak to him in his own words: either he knew all this, or he did not. If he did not, how could he call a reading various and uncertain, when their is none so clear, and so free from exceptions; and if he did, how could he have the Conscience to do it?

But admitting that *God* is not in the Text, what then? The stress of the Argument does not lye in the word *God*, which these Gentlemen understand

as

as they pleaſe, but in the word *bleſſed over all*, which belongs to none but God. Mark. 14. 61. *Art thou the Chriſt, the Son of the bleſſed?* By which word *bleſſed* the the High-Prieſt underſtands in the dialect of the Jews, the Holy one, the Almighty, the only true God. *Rom.* 1. 25. and 11. 36. 2. *Cor.* 11, 31. *Gal.* 1. 5. 1 *Tim.* 1. 7. in all which places and great many more is a perpetual acknowledgement of that Eternal Glory which is God's, and infinitely tranſcends any Created Being. Nor can there be a more ſubſtantial proof of the Divinity of *Chriſt*, than this, that that Glory is given him, as in this Text, which by the unanimous conſent of the Scriptures is given only to God. *Heb.* 13. 22. 1 *Pet.* 4. 11. and 5. 11. 2 *Pet.* 3. 18. *Rev.* 1. 6.

2*ly*, The punctuation of *Eraſmus* and *Curcellæus*, and the addition of the word *be*, is a bold and preſumptuous attempt, unknown to all Antiquity, and which the *Arrians* themſelves never thought of. If this liberty is granted there is not a place in Scripture but what may be perverted; men muſt leave off to talk and reaſon. There can be no Faith, no candor left in diſputes. The honeſteſt diſcourſe by the means of a different punctuation of the words may be made obſcure and infamous. But it is the ſickneſs of theſe Gentlemen; The Bible will not ſay, what they would have it to ſay, and therefore they muſt add Particles, and Comma's, and alter an order which ought to be Sacred and inviolable. But after all this, the Criticiſm, ſays *Beza*, on this place is little and ſilly. It is known to any one who has the ſmalleſt tincture of the Greek Tongue, that ὁ with a Participle is the ſame as ὅς. He ſends *Eraſmus* for this to School; and this uſe of the Greek Tongue I take to be the reaſon that neither *Aſterius* the Grammarian, nor the other *Arrians* who underſtood the extent of their own language ever made this exception.

3ly, That these words *concerning the Flesh*, do no more suppose a Divine nature in *Christ*, than in *Abraham*, these Gentlemen are not pleas'd to observe that there is in the Text an actual comparison of two natures; of *Christ* as Man, and of *Christ* who is God blessed over all; of *Christ* who in the first capacity is descended from the Jews, and is a Jew according to the Flesh: and of *Christ* who in the other has a communication of the Divine Nature, and is God blessed over all. It is easy to see, says the Author of the Answer to Mr *Milbourn*, that these expressions in the places cited by him, are only as much as to say, according to the Body. I grant it. But I affirm, that it is easy to see that the Apostle speaks in those places Absolutely, and without relation to any thing else; and that here he speaks relatively to another being which Christ has. This appears not only from the thing it self where there is an obvious comparison; but from the very way of expressing of the Greek, which our language cannot reach. In all the places cited by these Gentlemen, according to the Flesh is express'd without any Article, κατὰ σαρκὰ, to determine it to any sence than what really it has. But when this is say'd of *Christ*, There the τὸ κατὰ σαρκὰ, by which it is compar'd to somewhat else. The Apostle has it clearly, *Rom.* 1. 2, and 3. *made according to the Flesh*; where the Flesh does not signify the body, as the places which they have cited to elude the force of this Text; but the humane nature of *Christ*, in opposition to these words, *according to the Spirit of Holiness*, by which the Divine is express'd. This explication is of St. *Chrysostom* on this place, *Theodoret*, and long before of *Tertullian* adv. Prax. *Made of the seed of David, according to the Flesh*, says that Father, *Here is the man, and the Son of man. And declar'd to be the Son of God, according to the Holy Spirit. Hic est Deus & sermo Dei filius.* This is the God,

God, and the word the Son of God. This was the Divinity of *Tertullian*'s time before the Council of *Nice*.

Having done with this Text, I paſs to *Act.* 20. 28. St. *Paul* taking his leave of the *Aſian* Biſhops, exhorts them pathetically to that diligence and care which is the ſource of all Paſtoral Vertues. He urges it on theſe two Motives; 1*ſt*, That they have receiv'd their power from the Holy Ghoſt. 2*ly*, That the Church which he exhorts them to feed, is the Church for which *God* has been pleas'd to dye. *Feed the Church of God which he has purchas'd with his own blood.* This is ſpoken of a God by nature, ſince according to the *Socinian* Rule God is nam'd here with an Article. It is not only a God, but the God. He has purchas'd to himſelf a Church, he has bought us with a price; and becauſe without remiſſion of Sin there is no redemption, and there is no remiſſion without blood, he has purchas'd us with blood. But the blood of Goats and Calves, the blood of others being of it ſelf ineffectual, and only Figurative, he has ſhed his own blood for us. This cannot be ſay'd of the Father who theſe Gentlemen deny and with a great deal of reaſon to have ſuffer'd. Nor can it be aſſerted of the Holy Spirit, ſince they aſſure him to be only a power, and an *energy*, and it is ridiculous to ſay, that an *energy* ſhed his own blood. It can be ſay'd of none but the Son, who having taken our nature upon him became our Mediator, and High-Prieſt, and *by his own blood*, that blood which he ſhed for the Church, *obtain'd eternal redemption for us.* But that High-Prieſt, that Mediator, that *Chriſt*, is ſay'd to be *the God*; therefore he muſt be partaker of the Divine Nature; and ſince the Father is *the God*, and he is alſo *the God*, there muſt be more perſons than one ſubſiſting in the Deity.

This is deciding and concluſive. Yet the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 34. makes theſe exceptions.

1*ſt*, "That in the *Armenian*, *Syriack*, and the moſt "ancient of the Greek Bibles, the reading is not *the* "*Church of God*, but *of Chriſt*. 2*ly*, That admitting the "reading *God* in the vulgar Editions of the Greek, yet "ſome great Maſters of the Greek Tongue have ren-"der'd the Greek words thus. *Feed the Church of God* "*which he has purchas'd with his own Son's blood.* 3*ly*, "That admitting the Tranſlation in our Engliſh Bi-"bles, ſome learned men, particularly *Eraſmus*, "have noted, that the blood of *Chriſt* is here call'd "the blood of God, becauſe it was the blood which "God gave for the redemption of the World: ſo "*Joh* 1. 36. *This is the lamb of God*, that is, the lamb "of Sacrifice which God gives for the ſins of the "world.

Theſe Gentlemen have the misfortune to call every thing an Anſwer. 1*ſt*, It is true that in ſome Copies theſe words have been read with ſome alteration, but nothing at all to their purpoſe; ſome few have read, *the Church of the Lord*, others, *the Church of the Lord and God*; but none the Church of Chriſt. They will much oblige the Common-wealth of Learning, if they will produce any of theſe beſt and moſt ancient Copies. A very learned Man of this Age has pretended to prove, that *the Church of Chriſt* is not the language of the Scripture; and that when the Church is ſpoken of, by way of eminence, as it is in this Text, ἡ ἐκκλησία, *The Church*, it is often ſay'd to be ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ, *The Church of God*, but never the Church of Chriſt: And this Criticiſm they will find true, if they give themſelves the trouble to examine it. *The Syriack* Interpreter is rather an Expoſitor than a Tranſlator: The Latin who is wholly a Tranſlator and not an Expoſitor reads *Eccleſiam Dei*, The Church of God.

The ſecond part of their Anſwer that ſome great Maſters of the Greek Tongue have render'd, *his own Son's blood*, inſtead of *his own blood*, is a crying, notorious, and

and unpardonable falſification of a Text. What will be the end of our diſputes, if when we are preſs'd with the undenyable evidence of a Scripture, we preſume to add words to it, and uſher in that Sacrilegious attempt upon the word of God, with ſaying, ſome great Maſters of the Greek Tongue? When theſe Gentlemen talk of *Syriack*, *Arabick*, *Coptick*, *Armenian*, they may eaſily impoſe upon the ſimple; but for *Greek* which is common to all profeſſions in this Kingdom, to tell us, that διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος, *with his own proper blood*, is *with his Son's blood*; to make the falſification Authentick by Attributing it to the great Maſters of the Greek Tongue, and call this an Anſwer to a ſolid Objection is a piece of an Incomprehenſible Confidence.

3*ly*, *Socinus* and *Chrellius* were more dexterous; who being preſs'd by this Text very fairly lay'd aſide the word ἰδίου, *own*, wherein lyes the ſtreſs of the Argument; but call'd it as *Eraſmus* has done, the blood of God the Father; that is, the blood which God gave for the redemption of the World. They muſt forgive me, if I ſay that this is a meer trifle. God's own Lamb is the Lamb of God. God's own Son, is the Son of God. And God's own blood is the blood of him who is God.

Tit. 2. 13 was urg'd by the Fathers againſt the *Arrians*, as a clear proof of the Divinity of Chriſt, *Looking for that bleſſed hope and the glorious appearing of the Great God, and our Saviour Jeſus Chriſt.*

The Author of the Brief Hiſtor. *pag.*—— ſays to this, 1*ſt*. That nothing hinders that we may believe that not only the Lord *Chriſt*, but God himſelf will appear at the laſt judgment. 2*ly*, That the Glory of the Great God, is the Pomp, Power and Angels that God even the Father will cauſe to accompany *Chriſt* in that day. *Matt.* 16. 27. *The Son ſhall appear in the Glory of his Father with his*, the Father's *Angels*.

The first of these two assertions is contrary to the Gospel, *Joh.* 5. 22. *The Father judges no man, but has committed all judgment to the Son.* The second is as contrary as the first, *Matt.* 25. 31. *When the Son of man shall come in his Glory .... Then shall he sit upon the Throne of his Glory.*

But all this is nothing to the purpose, and diverts instead of resolving the question. The only difficulty which can be propos'd the Author of the History has declin'd. We prove from this Text that the *Great God and* our Saviour *Jesus Christ* is the same Person. That the Great God and Saviour are predicated, or say'd of *Christ*. This ought to have been deny'd, and reasons given for it; and this would have been to the purpose. But This Author saw it was not possible, and that the Greek dialect excludes in this place all the little Criticisms which come in heaps in other places. I wonder that those great Masters of the Greek Tongue, who did presume in the Text disputed of before this, to put *the blood of his own Son*, in the room of *his own blood*, have not here added an Article, and read, *The Great God and the Saviour J. C.* and pretended some ancient Copies, that *Curcellæus*, or some body else had seen. This Text then is undoubtedly ours. *The Great God and Saviour of us*, is the same way of speaking as *The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ*, The conjunctive Particle which unites *God* and *Father*, uniting also *God* and *Saviour*. Nor can they so much as dream here of a deputed God; since there is an Article here, and the Epithet *Great* added to it.

But nothing shews so much how far these Gentlemen are prejudic'd against the plainest evidence, than their answers to *Joh.* 20. 28. ὁ κύριός μου, καὶ ὁ θεός μου. *The Lord of me*, and *the God of me*. *Socinus*, says the Author of the Answer to Mr. *Milbourn*, *pag.* 32, and 34. with two more learned Unitarians contend,

"That

"That it was the intention of *Thomas* to call our "Saviour *His Lord*, and *his God*, but it is in no other "ſenſe than *Solomon*, Pſ. 45. *Moſes*, and *Samuel*. That "*God* is us'd amongſt the Eaſtern People, as the word "*Lord* is us'd amongſt us, who do not deſign to make "a Man a God becauſe we ſpeak to him with a name "which we alſo uſe to God. Yet though this comes from *Socinus*, this Author is not willing to ſtand to it. He ſays, "This interpretation is likely to be "true, but that divers learned Perſons amongſt their "Oppoſers, and even of old *Neſtorius* and *Theodore* of "*Mopſweſt* were of opinion, that *My Lord*, and *My "God*, are only words of admiration and thanks, di-"rected not to our Saviour, but to God. They are "an exclamation expreſſing the Apoſtle's amazement "to find his Maſter was riſen. He ſends us to the "Brief Hiſtory.

The Author of that Hiſtory is ſo little taken with the deputed God of *Socinus*, that he has not one Syllable of it. He ſays, *pag.* 32. "That *Neſtorius* "was of opinion that the words were not deſign'd to "*Chriſt*, but to God. For though the Evangeliſt ſays, "*Thomas anſwer'd and ſay'd to him*, yet the exclamati-"on might be adreſs'd to God, as its object, and the "anſwer, to our Saviour. ..... It may be admitted "as true what others ſay. *O my Lord*, are words of "congratulation to our Saviour, *O my God*, words of "admiration and praiſe to God.

Thus theſe Gentlemen cut and flaſh the Scripture, and ſhew how men who depart from the truth, are inconſiſtent with themſelves. *Socinus* overcome by the evidence of the thing, acknowledges the words to be ſpoken to *Chriſt*, but contrary to his own rule, though the words are with an Article and ſo muſt belong to the true God, will have them to be underſtood of a deputed God, or a God by Office. *Neſtorius*, *Theodore* and theſe Gentlemen are convinc't that the God ſpo-

ken of here, is the Almighty. But though the Text expreſsly ſays, *and Thomas anſwer'd and ſay'd to him, My Lord, and My God*, yet it muſt not be to him, but to God himſelf. They ſeparate what the ſpirit of God has join'd; and though it is as clear as the Sun, that the word, *My God*, is ſay'd to him to whom the word *My Lord* is ſpoken, being both join'd by the Particle *and*, yet this will not do, one part muſt be a Compliment to *Chriſt*, the other a Prayer to God.

Theſe Gentlemen would fain have new Bibles. The Author of the Anſwer to My Lord of *Sarum*, *pag.* 30. "There will be no need of our Anſwers, or Defences, "if there were but an honeſt Edition of the Bible. "..... We have no reform'd Bibles, none that have "been corrected to ſpeak the Doctrines of the Church, "rather than of the Goſpel. But 'tis above 1200 "Years that others have been Modelling the common "Bibles, by the Doctrines, and Articles of our Holy "Mother Church. I think they do not ask enough. I would have them alſo find out a new Language, new ways for men to expreſs themſelves by. I would have them procure an Act of Parliament by which it ſhall be Enacted, that to Anſwer, and to ſpeak to a Man, ſhall not be to anſwer, and to ſpeak to him, but to ſome body elſe. I would have them take ſuch vulgar notions as theſe out of men's heads, and create in them new methods of thinking and receving impreſſions from what they hear, by being perſwaded that though they receive an anſwer, yet it is not to them that it is given. Truly had I been in the Fifth General Council, where this anſwer of *Theodore* was condemn'd by the Fathers, *ſyn.* 5. *coll.* 4. I would not only have Anathematis'd the Impiety, but alſo the folly and impertinence of the Opinion. Theſe two anſwers then invincibly confute one another. *Socinus* confutes that part which would not have the words to be ſpoken to the Saviour; and theſe Gentlemen confute

ſute that part which makes the God who is ſpoken to, to be a deputed God. They lead us to the true ſence of this Text, that *Thomas* an Apoſtle has fully acknowledg'd that Chriſt is truly, and really God.

This Text has the advantage that it is unconteſted, and come down to us without the leaſt alteration. All is plain and clear in it. The reſurrection of Chriſt was deny'd by *Thomas*. His incredulity, ſays elegantly St. *Auſtin*, was more uſeful to the Church, than the Faith of the other Apoſtles. He proteſted that *except he ſaw in his hands the prints of the nails*, &c. he would not believe. The merciful Saviour condeſcends to let him make the Experiment which draws preſently that noble confeſſion of his Faith, *My Lord, and My God*: Which is the ſame as if he had ſay'd, I believe that thou art my Lord and my God. This interpretation is evident; 1*ſt*, By the words of *Chriſt* in the next Verſe, where the Saviour takes no kind of notice of any Admiration, or Exclamation, as theſe Gentlemen would have it, but only replies to that profeſſion of his Faith, *Becauſe thou haſt ſeen Me thou haſt believ'd*; and lays down this Maxim the comfort of Chriſtians in all ſucceeding Ages; *Bleſſed are they that have not ſeen, and yet have believ'd.* 2*ly*, The laſt Verſe of this Chapter intimates that this Hiſtory is written, that by that Zealous confeſſion of his Faith, we might alſo be induc'd to believe, *v.* 31. *But theſe things are written that you might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God.* 3*ly*, The reſurrection of Chriſt was to be a proof of his Divinity. Rom, 1. 4. *declar'd to be the Son of God with power .... by the reſurrection from the dead.* It was not by being riſen from the dead that *Jeſus* was the Son of God: But his reſurrection was a Declaration to all Mankind, that he was ſo; and therefore *Thomas* being ſatisfy'd of his Reſurrection, owns him for *His Lord and his God.*

The Fancy then of a deputed God has nothing to do

do here, nor indeed any where elſe. The Notion it ſelf is contradictory and impoſſible. I eaſily apprehend how a Man may be ſent from God, and intruſted with his commands to the reſt of his Fellow Creatures. But the very name of God excludes office and deputation. A made God is that which cannot be made; A deputed God is that which cannot be deputed. The office of God is God himſelf. When the Lord ſays to *Moſes* Exod. 7. 1. *See I have made thee a God to Pharaoh*, he explains what that is in the next Verſe, *Thou ſhalt ſpeak all that I command thee.* This is no deputed Divinity. There is not a God in Heaven, and a deputed God upon Earth. If the expreſſion ſignifies no more than to ſpeak or act from God, not only *Moſes* and the Prophets, but every Father of a Family is a deputed God. If it imports no more, the notion is ſilly, and if it does, it is raſh and unintelligible.

Socinus ſeeing Chriſt call'd God, and the Son of God ſo very often in Scripture, thought it a very eaſy way to rid himſelf of ſo many pregnant places gave him by this imaginary or deputed God, which he thought to have found in this miſtaken place of *Exod.* and in *Pſ.* 45. As if theſe two ſolitary Expreſſions could ballance, or equal thoſe repeated ones which aſſure us, that Chriſt is truly God. In one ſingle place of Scripture *Moſes* is ſay'd to be a God to *Pharaoh.* In innumerable places of Scripture Chriſt is call'd God, the Son of God, has the Names, the Attributes, the Nature of God, given him; Therefore *Moſes* is God as *Chriſt*, and Chriſt God as *Moſes*, both deputed Gods. A wild and irregular way of reaſoning! Nor do I wonder that *Socinus* ſhould be guilty of this: Though a Man of learning and parts, and the unhappy reſtorer of an Hereſy long ſince bury'd in a deep Oblivion, and the firſt of a Sect to which he has left his name. It happen'd to him as to many

many who have not time to refine their Arguments, and do not ſo well underſtand their own ſyſtem as they that come after. But I admire that Gentlemen who have receded from ſo many inadvertencies of *Socinus*, and of his outlandiſh followers, and have really given a turn and a force to great many of their Arguments which they themſelves did not, nor could ever have done, have not yet parted from this poor, mean, empty, and if I am not too rude, ridiculous notion of a deputed God.

But admitting that *Moſes* is ſuch, and that his perſonal qualifications, the diginity of his Office, his commerce with God, and his diſtinction from a people which it ſelf was diſtinguiſh'd from all the Nations in the Earth, give him a title to it, St. *Paul* has clearly ſtated the difference, and ſhews that if *Moſes* in theſe Gentlemen's Principles is a God by Office, *Chriſt* muſt be a God by Nature. *Heb.* 3. 2, 3, 4. The Author of the Epiſtle compares *Chriſt* with *Moſes*. He ſays that *Chriſt* our High-Prieſt *was faithful to him that appointed him, as alſo Moſes was faithful in all his houſe*; then *v.* 3. he ſhews how much *Chriſt* excells *Moſes*, even as much as an Architect excell his own work, *in as much as he that built the houſe, has more honour than the houſe*. In as much as the maker of *Moſes* is more excellent than *Moſes* himſelf. He concludes *v.* 4. *every houſe is built by ſome man, but he that builds all theſe things*, not *all things*, as our tranſlation reads, *is God*. Every building has ſome Man for its Architect, but theſe things which are built by *Chriſt* do far excel, becauſe the builder is God. If *Moſes* then in theſe Gentlemen's ſuppoſition is a God by Office, what ſort of God is Chriſt, who is the Maker of the God by Office? And how much of their aſſurance muſt theſe Gentlemen abate, who when any preſſing place is cited of *Chriſt* being call'd God, ſend us dogmatically to *Moſes*.

The

The Author of the Brief Hiſtory, *pag.* 41. has cited indeed both this Chapter and theſe Verſes, but has been very careful to avoid the objection by overlooking the 4. *v.* and indeed I commend him for it; The difficulty is real and ſolid. He plays at croſs purpoſes, and after his *Laconick* way of ſpeaking, he tells us, that the Houſe here is not mens bodies, but the Church of *Chriſt*, which he under God is ſaid to build: and ſo he diſmiſſes us: whereas the Text does not ſay, he builds under God, but that he is God who builds all theſe things.

Many other places might be alledg'd to that purpoſe, but theſe are ſo clear, and the pretended Anſwers to them ſo inſufficient, that the aſſertion of the Author of the Conſider. on the Sermon of the Biſhop of *Worceſter*, pag. 11. will appear ſtrangely confident, "That it cannot be ſatisfactorily prov'd that any "Authentick Copies of the Bible, do give *Chriſt* the "title of God, as he ſays the Author of the Brief Hiſt. has abundantly ſhewn. The Author of the Hiſtory has not, and none of theſe Gentlemen will ever be able to do it. But it is the character of this Author in this Book, in the Anſwer to Mr. *Milbourn*, in that to Mr. *la Motté*, to venture upon any thing that comes firſt to hand, and to want that candor and modeſty, that cool temper which the Author of the Hiſtory has, and would be a great Ornament to his Parts and Learning.

One thing more I have to ſay before I conclude this, and it is, that beſides thoſe Arguments which have been lay'd before you, no Man can ſeriouſly read the ſacred writings, but he will find thoſe things ſay'd of *Chriſt* and to *Chriſt*, which no meer Creature is capable of.

1*ſt*, He is repreſented to us in ſuch a height as tranſcends all Created Beings. Phil. 2. 9, 10. *That in the name of Jeſus, every knee ſhould bow, of things in Heaven,*

ven, and things in Earth, and things under the Earth. 1 Pet. 3. 22. *Angels and authorities and powers are made ſubject to him.* Matt. 28. 18. *All power is given me in Heaven and Earth.* Joh. 15. 16. *All things that the Father has are mine,* Joh. 15. 5. *without me you can do nothing.* He commands the Sea, the Winds, the Devils, *&c.* He gives to others the power that he has, Mark. 16. 17, 18. *In my name ſhall they caſt out Devils,* &c. All this looks like Omnipotency. If he is not God, men are naturally lead to Idolatry, by ſeeing in a Man all that we adore in God, and by which he is known to us.

2*ly*, Some men are call'd the Sons of God as *Adam*, the Angels, and juſt men who are all God's adopted Sons. But *Chriſt* is call'd the Son of God, ſo very often, ſo very Emphatically, with ſo great a ſolemnity, that it is unconceivable how this can be ſay'd of one who has no other relation to God, but to be the work of his hands, or the object of his favour. Act. 8. 37. *And Philip ſay'd, if thou believ'ſt with all thy heart, thou may'ſt; and he Anſwer'd and ſay'd, I believe that Jeſus Chriſt is the Son of God.* In the great uncertainty who that miraculous Perſon was, whether *Elias*, or *John* the Baptiſt, or any of the Prophets, St. *Peter* makes this confeſſion, Matt. 16. 16. *thou art Chriſt the Son of the living God. Chriſt* himſelf replies, that on this confeſſion the Church is buil't, on this the ſalvation of men depends. *v.* 17. That this is not the reſult of natural inquiry, and *that Fleſh and blood has not reveal'd it to him, but my Father which is in Heaven.* A declaration made not only by poor men here below, but come down from above, once at his Baptiſm, *Matt.* 3. 17. a ſecond time in the glory of his transfiguration. Matt. 17. 5. *This is my beloved Son.* An homage which the very unclean ſpirits, the Devils themſelves pay'd him. Mark. 3. 11. *and the unclean ſpirits when they ſaw him fell before him .... thou art*

the

the Son of God. and Mark. 5. 7. *the Son of the most High God.* If to be the Son of God is no more than to be remarkable by the examples of a holy life, though in as great a measure as our nature is capable of; Is it not unaccountable that revelation should be necessary; that Heaven should inform us, that the very Devils should proclaim it; that our Faith, and Eternal Salvation should be built upon it? Does not this naturally incline men to believe that this very *Jesus* in that despicable nature by which he appears as a Man, has another which none but the Father could reveal, and is far beyond the discoveries of Flesh and Blood?

3*ly*, None but God could descend to the incredible humiliation of *Christ Jesus.* No Man can properly be say'd to humble himself, no not to the death of the Cross. None humbles himself in dying, who is form'd to dye. No Creature humbles it self in suffering who is born to suffer, and is subject to vanity. I understand how God humbles himself in becoming Man. This is easy to apprehend. But how the best of men can humble himself in becoming Man when it is not at all his choice; and in suffering for his Fellow Creatures, which even in the sence of bad men is the most glorious thing in the World, is past my apprehension. None but he can humble himself, in whom is found between the state that he is in, and that which he assumes, an infinite disproportion. Nothing shews more evidently what Christ was before his humiliation than that series and order of stupendous Miracles which attend that very state. To be figur'd by the Patriarchs, announc't by the Prophets, to be born of a Virgin, to be declar'd by the Angels, *Immanuel, God with us*; to exercise a despotick power over the whole Creation, to rise from the dead, to ascend to Heaven, to sit at the right hand of God, are convincing Arguments that he is more than a Creature.

3*ly*,

3*ly*, The name of Lord is given him, which all the Interpreters agree is the *Jehovah* of the Hebrews. These Gentlemen must own this themselves. I know that the Author of the Considerat. on the Bishop of *Sarum*'s Fourth Discourse *pag.* 22. has quarrell'd with his Lordship, because he says that it is the peculiar name of God. He tells him that the *Socinians* deny it, and pretend to prove that the name *Jehovah* is given to particular Persons and communities, and *pag.* 23, 24. that we are like to have great many *Jehovahs*, since if the word *Lord* is *Jehovah*, that *Pontius Pilate* is call'd so, *Matt.* 27. 63. that Κύριε, *Lord*, is no more than Master, and Sir, *Joh.* 20. 15.

But I know also that all this is a quibble, and that such things as these are should not drop from the Pen of a Learned Man, as this Author is; nor to such a knowing Person as the Bishop. For who is he that has the least tincture of Hebrew but knows that the sacred name *Jehovah* signifies Essence, Existence, and nothing else. As God himself has express'd it, Exod. 3. 14. *I am, that I am*; which if it is not peculiar to God a Primitive and Self Existent being, I know nothing that is peculiar to him. This is so true, that *Chrellius* himself has own'd *that it follows the nature of proper names.* It is undenyable, that the Translators of the Old Testament, have constantly render'd *Jehovah* by the word, *Lord*; and it is from thence that the sacred writers of the New Testament, who as the Bishop observes, were Jews, spoke like Jews, and understood the full importance of their own language, have Attributed it to *Christ.* And though the word *Lord* sometimes signifies no more, than *Sir*, or *Master*, as in the instances produc't by this Author, yet the stream of the Scriptures is against this mean shift. Act. 10. 36. *he is Lord of all.* Act. 2. 36. *God has made him Lord and Christ.* Rom. 14. 9. *The Lord both of the dead and living.* 1 Cor. 2. 8. *The Lord of Glory.*

Glory. Revel. 19. 16. *Lord of Lords.* But particularly 1 Cor. 8. 5, 6. *For though there be that are call'd Gods, whether in Heaven, and in Earth, as there be Gods many, and Lords many, To us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things and we in him, and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things, and we by him.* None of these places can be understood of *Master*, and *Sir*. The first notion which they present to the mind is of a sovereign, supreme, and Divine Authority. The name *Jehovah* being given to Persons, Angels, places, and communities, is another miserable evasion. Nay, it is a substantial proof for us; For if that sacred name was only given to places which God honour'd with his presence, or to them in whom he spoke; It shews that the presence of God was the only reason of the name. It remains still proper to him; and there being no presence of God so great and so intimate as the Union of the two Natures, and God appearing visibly so much in no Man as in *Christ Jesus*, he is truly our *Jehovah*.

4*ly*, Who can think *Christ* a meer Man, a meer Creature, as these Gentlemen call him, who seriously considers the words of St. *Peter*, act. 4. 12. *Neither is there Salvation in any other, for there is no other name under Heaven, given amongst men, by which we must be sav'd*: Coloss. 3. 17. *Whatsoever you do, in word, or deed, do all in the name of Jesus.* Matt. 1. 21. *he shall save his People from their sins.* Eph. 1. 7. *in whom we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins.* I beg of them to leave Mankind to the common notices which they bring with them into the World, and not to overrule that universal way of thinking which the Creator has given them. Is this spoken of the Doctrine or of the Person of the Holy *Jesus?* Does not all this suppose an excellency which no Created being can attain to? Can saving, redeeming, forgiving, atoning, be the privilege of any creature? If

the

the Prophet ſpeaking of men's natural death ſays, Pſal. 49. 7. that *no man can redeem his brother, nor give to God a ranſom for him*, how much leſs can any one free us from the Eternal Condemnation due to Sin?

5ly, The coming of no Man into the World is expreſs'd as that of *Chriſt*. Leave one to himſelf out of the noiſe and prejudice of a diſpute, and in the reading of the Scripture he will eaſily ſee that it ſuppoſes knowledge, Choice, Pre-Exiſtence in him, who took our nature. 2 Cor. 8. 9. *You know the Grace of our Lord J. C. that though he was rich, yet for our ſakes he became poor, that we through his proverty might become rich.* Phil. 2. 7. *He took upon him the form of a ſervant, was made in the likeneſs of men, was found in faſhion as a man.* Heb. 2. 16. *he took not on him the nature of Angels, but he took on him the ſeed of Abraham.* 1 Joh. 5. 20. *and we know that the Son of God is come.* 1 Joh. 3. 8. *For this purpoſe the Son of God was manifeſted*, appear'd, *to deſtroy the works of the Devil.* Heb. 9. 25. *he has appear'd to put away ſin by the ſacrifice of himſelf.*

6ly, The Grace of God by which he pardons our ſins, and capacitates us for an Eternal Life is ſo peculiar to God that no Man has yet pretended to deny it. But how often is it attributed to *Chriſt?* Act. 15. 11. *but we believe that through the Grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, we ſhall be ſaved, even as they.* 2 Cor. 12. 9. *and he ſay'd to me, my Grace is ſufficient for thee, for my ſtrength is made perfect in weakneſs; moſt gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Chriſt may reſt upon me.* The Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 37. is ſtrangely Embaraſs'd to anſwer this. He ſays, "That the words before the Text cited, *I beſought* "*the Lord thrice*, ... are ſpoken to God, not to "*Chriſt*. The power of *Chriſt* is the ſtrength which he "procures by his mediation with God. The *Socinians* "for the moſt part grant that the *word*, or power of "God abiding in *Chriſt* does qualify him to hear "our Prayers.

I would ask this Author, if the words are ſpoken to God, what ſignifies this *Socinian* acknowledgment of *Chriſt* hearing our Prayers, which overthrows all the reſt? And if they are ſpoken to *Chriſt*, why did he not conſider better before he deny'd it? He ſaw, and ſo muſt the moſt infatuated Perſon, that the power of *Chriſt*, is that Grace, which is ſufficient and was ſo earneſtly pray'd for, and that it is the Grace of him who was pray'd to, and who anſwer'd the Apoſtle, Gal. 2. 8. *He that wrought effectually in Peter to the Apoſtleſhip of the circumciſion, the ſame was mighty in me toward the Gentiles*, Eph. 2. 13. *But now in C. J. you who were ſometimes afar off, are made nigh by the blood of Chriſt.* Tit. 3. 7. *that being juſtify'd by his Grace we ſhould be made heirs according to the hope of Eternal life*, Rom. 16. 24. *The Grace of our Lord J. C. be with you all.* And more fully. 2 Cor. 13. 14. *The Grace of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, the Love of God, and the fellowſhip of the Holy Ghoſt be with you all.*

Theſe two laſt places they have excepted againſt. This laſt Text demonſtrates, ſays the Author of the Brief Hiſt. *pag.* 31. that neither the Lord *Chriſt* nor the Holy Spirit are God; for it plainly diſtinguiſhes them from God. I ſay that it demonſtates that the Lord *Chriſt* is God, ſince he is the Author and giver of Grace; and that the Holy Spirit is God ſince he communicates thoſe graces to us, which none but God can give, and both are join'd to God, who, as this very Author explains it in this very place, is the Father. So that it plainly diſtinguiſhes them not from God, but only from the Father, and ſhews excellently the operations of the Three Perſons. The Author of the anſwer to My Lord of *Sarum*, has foreſeen this, and therefore winds another way, and ſays *pag.* 21. that it is true, that Grace, Mercy and Peace are pray'd for from the Lord *Chriſt*, but that they are alſo pray'd from them who certainly are no Gods. Rev. 1. 4. *Grace be to you and peace from him which is,*

and

and which was, and which is to come, and from the seven spirits that are before his throne, and from J. C. But he seems to make no difference between a Salutation, and a Prayer. The one is the introduction to what St. *John* had to say, and from whom he spoke. The other is the conclusion of a discourse which to make the more effectual, he prays to *Christ* without whom we can do nothing, to give us his grace; to the Father, to continue those repeated Testimones of his love to us, and to the Holy Spirit, to influence us into the practice of the duty commanded. I may wish peace and grace to any Man from all the Angels in Heaven; but I must not pray for Grace Peace and Mercy to any created being.

This Author in the same page has given us a specimen how easy it is to extricate one self of the most substantial difficulties. 'Tis a folly to read, or think, There is a quicker way to strike dumb a Man of the Bishop's parts and judgment. His Lordship says that *Christ* cannot be a Creature, because the Apostle speaking of him says, Gal. 1. 5. *to whom be glory for ever, and ever*, an Enlogy given to none in Scripture but the Almighty. The Prelate follow'd in this the constant notion of the Jews, so visible in both the Testaments, that no truth is clearer, conceiving by the word *Glory*, either the essential happiness of God, his incomprehensible greatness, or his glorious appearance to men, and the earnest wishes of pious Souls that this should be for ever acknowledg'd by all his creatures. Matt. 6. 13. *for thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory for ever.* 1 *Sam.* 4.21. *Exod.* 24.16. *Esay.*6.1. *Job.*12.41. *Act.* 7. 55. *Mark.* 8. 38. 2 *Pet.* 1. 3. and very many other places. The way to answer this, is either to deny the notion, and shew that it is either false or mistaken: or else to prove that this way of expression is not us'd only to God. But this cannot be done; and therefore this Author replies, "That glory and ho-

"nour are Equivalent Terms in the Greek: that for "ever and ever is no more than for ever: that *Daniel* who ſay'd to a heathen Prince, *O king live for ever*, would not have ſcrupl'd to ſay, *O king, I wiſh thee glory for ever:* that he ſhould not be reckon'd an Idolater for wiſhing His Lordſhip perpetual honour.

One muſt have a great deal of charity to believe theſe Gentlemen to be in earneſt, and not endeavour to banter Religion out of doors, when ſuch crude and indigeſted anſwers drop from their Pen. Glory with them is no more than Honour, and Lord is no more than Maſter, and Sir, and Worſhip is the ſame as how do you do? To worſhip another, ſays this Author, *pag.* 27. often ſignifies no more than to ſalute them by bowing and the like, which ſuperiors do to inferiors. This is true. But when God brings the *firſt begotten* into the World, the *Emanuel*, *the God with us*, the Redeemer of Mankind, his only Son, when he ſubjects the whole Creation to him, and commands the very Angels to adore him, Heb. 1. 7. *and let all the Angels of God worſhip him*, does all this amount to no more than asking how he does do?

I will give one inſtance more how theſe Gentlemen take the wrong ſide of a thing when they pleaſe. His Lordſhip has inſiſted that it is a vaſt abſurditiy that the ſame acts in which we adore God ſhould be at the ſame time offer'd to a Creature, than which nothing is truer. But his Lordſhip, ſays this Author, *pag.* 26. is guilty of a much vaſter inadvertency, as he himſelf will be oblig'd to confeſs, when he caſts his Eye upon the following Text, 1 Chr. 29. 20. *All the congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers, and bowing their heads worſhipped the Lord and the King.* In which words worſhip is given to the King, as to the Lord, and yet is no Idolatry. But this Author is himſelf guilty of a vaſt miſtake. For worſhip as it is an act of Religion, is pay'd neither to the Lord, nor

nor to the King, in this laſt part of the Text. That that is adreſs'd to God is in the firſt. *All the congregation bleſſed the Lord God of their Fathers.* The reſt is no more than a civility pay'd, at their parting, to the King, who was then preſent, and to the place where they worſhip'd; as at this time we bow either in the Church, or towards the Altar; and yet on this ſort of trifling anſwers, theſe Gentlemen gravely inſiſt, to oppoſe the plaineſt and cleareſt truths.

Another Text he has cited to this purpoſe, 1 Tim. 5. 21. *I charge thee before God, and the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the elect Angels,* where ſays this Author an Apoſtle joins Creatures with God in the Higheſt act of Religion, *i. e.* an adjuration. I can ſee nothing in this like Religious worſhip. The Apoſtle prays neither to God, nor to *Chriſt*, nor to the Angels. He might as well have added before the Holy City, and before all the World. St. *Paul* had given thoſe directions to *Timothy* which have been the ground of all the Canons made ſince in the Church. He inſiſts that he ſhould be faithful to them, and as a motive to his obedience, he intreats him by all that is holy, by God, by *J. C.* by the Elect Angels. This I find to be the ſence of moſt Interpreters; nor do I know any amongſt the ancients, or the Proteſtant Commentators, who ſo much as dream't that this did import adoration to any creature.

7*ly*, To adore, to truſt in, to believe, are Acts which can have none but God for their object. But all this is ſo often attributed to *Chriſt*, that it cannot be deny'd with any ſort of modeſty. Heb. 1. 7. *let all the Angels of God worſhip him*, Matt. 12. 21. *in his name ſhall the Gentiles truſt*, render'd by the Apoſtle, *in him ſhall the Gentiles truſt.* Eph. 1. 12, 13. *that we ſhould be to the praiſe of his glory who firſt truſted in Chriſt, in whom alſo you truſted after that you heard the word of truth, the Goſpel of your ſalvation, in whom alſo after*

that you believ'd, you were seal'd with that holy Spirit of promise, Act. 20. 21. *repentance towards God and Faith towards our Lord J.C.* 2 Tim. 3. 15. *which are able to make thee wise to salvation through faith which is in C. J.* Gal. 2. 16. *knowing that a man is not justify'd . . . . but by the Faith of J.C. even we have believ'd in J.C. that we might be justify'd by the faith of Christ.* The Scripture is so full to this, that it is not so much to cite as to transcribe.

But is this Author serious when *pag.* 26. of his answer to the Bishop, to elude the strength of this, and of five hundred places more, he brings in dogmatically, 1 Sam. 12. 18. *The people greatly fear'd the Lord and Samuel*, and Exod. 14. 31. *The people believ'd the Lord, and his servant Moses.* I wonder he has omitted, *fear God and honour the King*, for it is as much to the purpose. Will men ever be guilty of that crying injustice to pretend to overthrow the Faith once deliver'd to the Saints, and ruine at once the Authority of vast many Texts, by one or two single and solitary places of Scripture, which when all is done signify nothing to the question in hand. *Christ* is propos'd to Mankind as the Son of God, as the Saviour and Redeemer of their Souls, as the only name under Heaven by which we can be sav'd. The end of the Scripture is that we should believe in him; he that believes shall be sav'd: he that does not believe is condemn'd already, and we are put off with *Moses* and *Samuel*, whom the people did believe, because they confirm'd, by a Miracle, the truth which they deliver'd.

8ly, He that is pray'd to is God, for none but God can be the object of our Prayers. To hear, to know, to relieve our wants naturally supposes Omniscience and Omnipotence. It is incomprehensible that the generality of *Socinians* should contend that *Christ is to be pray'd to*, which is the assertion of the Author of the Brief History, *pag.* 33, and *worship'd with divine worship*,

worſhip, and yet deny him to be God. To give Divine worſhip to a creature, is a plain, and inexcuſable Idolatry. Strange! that the force of truth ſhould extort from them that he is to be ador'd, and yet that he is not God the only being whom we ought to adore!

The Engliſh *Sotinians* ſee the force of this conſequence, therefore they deny that *Chriſt* is to be pray'd to. But one cannot read without indignation this aſſertion of the Author in their defence, *pag.* 33. It appears, ſays he, by St. *Auſtin* and *Photius*, that *Origen* deny'd that the Son was to be ador'd, or pray'd to. He cites *Origen lib.* 8. *contr. Celſ.* who ſays he, expreſly deny'd that *Chriſt* is to be invocated; he adds, that it cannot be doubted, that *Origen* ſpoke the ſence of the Catholick Church of his time. This Author then is poſitive, that neither *Origen*, nor the Church in his time, believ'd it lawful to pray to *Chriſt*. But he ſhould have taken the pains to read the place which he has cited. He muſt have been convinc't that he has cited at random, and that *Origen* has no ſuch thing. The 8*th* Book alledg'd with ſo much aſſurance by the Author has not a ſingle line which ſeems to have a tendency to this. On the contrary it has invincible proofs that *Origen*, and conſequently the Catholick Church of his time did think it not only lawful, but even neceſſary to pray to Chriſt.

The Father begins that very Book by *imploring the help of God, and of the word the only begotten of God, on himſelf who having finiſh'd the* 7*th, was now writing the* 8*th Book againſt the lyes and ſlanders of* Celſus. Having aſſerted the Pre-Exiſtence and Eternity of *Chriſt*, his moſt intimate Union with the Father, he ſays, *pag.* 386. Edit. Cantab. *We adore one God, and his only Son, his word, and his image with our ſupplications, offering our prayers to God through his only Son, to whom firſt we addreſs them, beſeeching him, that as he is a propitiation for our*

ſins, he would like our High-Prieſt, offer to the moſt high God, our prayers, interceſſions, ſacrifices, &c. pag. 305. *None is to be pray'd to but the moſt High God, and the only begotten, the firſt born of every Creature, the word of God,* pag. 422. *We ſing Hymns only to God who is above all things, and to God the word his only begotten Son.* This ſhews the practice and belief of the Church of that time and of the very Primitive Church before, to adore *Chriſt* in thoſe Hymns made in his praiſe. *Carmen Chriſto quaſi Deo dicere ſecum invicem* ſays *Pliny* to the Emperor, lib. 10 Epiſt. 97. *to ſing an Hymn amongſt themſelves to Chriſt, as God.* An authority brought by *Tertullian Apol. c.* 2. which teaches us, that all that *Pliny* could know of their Religious rites, was that they met before day, *ad canendum Chriſto ut Deo, to ſing Hymns to Chriſt as to their God.* I know that theſe Gentlemen, who under pretence of Criticiſing will alter any writings, have pretended to read *Chriſto & Deo, to Chriſt and to God.* But I know this to be a willful miſtake, the ancient and genuine reading being *Chriſto ut Deo.* Thus *Euſebius* citing this very place of *Tertullian* Chron. l. 2. χριστὸν ὡς θεὸν ὑμνεῖν, tranſlated by St. *Jerom* in *Tertullian's* own words, *to ſing to Chriſt as God.* A practice which the ſame *Euſebius, Hiſt. lib.* 5. *c.* 28. ſays to have been of *Juſtin* Martyr, *Miltiades, Tatianus, Clemens, Melito, Irenee,* The earlieſt and beſt times of Chriſtianity having given this teſtimony to *Chriſt's* Divinity, and to the Prayers offer'd him.

But how could it ever enter into theſe Gentlemen's heads to deny praying to *Chriſt* upon ſuch unconcluding Arguments as the Anſwerer to Mr. *Milbourn*, and the Author of the Brief Hiſt. have us'd, when they cannot but ſee it practis'd in Scripture, *Luk.* 17. 5. *Lord increaſe our Faith*, Mark. 9. 24. *Lord I believe, help thou my unbelief.* Nor will the mean evaſion ſerve, that it is no more than recommending our ſelves to

one

one another's Prayers. What Creature dares to ſay to another Creature, without Blaſphemy, or Idolatry, *increaſe my Faith, help my unbelief*, Acts 7. 59. *They ſton'd Stephen calling upon God, and ſaying, Lord Jeſus receive my Spirit.* If this be not praying, adoring, and exerciſing the higheſt act of truſt imaginable, there is no ſuch thing in the World. Compare this place with 1 Pet. 4. 19. *commit the keeping of their Souls to him ..... as unto a faithful Creator*; and tell me the difference between committing our Souls, and offering our Spirit to be receiv'd.

The anſwer of the Author of the Hiſt. to this *pag.* 32. is ſo ſtrange, that had I ſeen it in any Book but his own, I wou'd have ſaid that it is a Satyr upon him, and a groſs ſlander. 1*ſt* Says he, the name *God*, is not in any Greek Copy. True: But does not προσευχειν to pray, to implore, or as the Latin Interpreter, to invocate, imply the word *God?* ſince the very action has God for its object. The Prebendaries of *Weſtminſter* are gone to pray; therefore they do not pray to God, becauſe the word *God* is not nam'd in the Propoſition. This is all fooliſh, ſince the very nature of the thing imports that it is to God to whom they make their addreſſes. 2*ly*, He ſays, that the Greek render'd Grammatically makes this ſence, *O Lord of Jeſus receive my ſpirit*, which is falſe, trifling, ridiculous, and not worth a reply. 3*ly*, He pretends the meaning to be only this, *Stephen call'd upon God, and ſay'd Lord Jeſus*, becauſe at the ſame time he ſaw Jeſus in a Prophetick Viſion, ſtanding at the right hand of God. This is ſillily and falſly alledged, *Stephen call'd upon God and ſaid*,---He who he ſpoke to, was he whom he call'd upon. Whether he ſaw him or no is not the queſtion? But the offering his departing Soul into his hands, and praying that he would receive it into his mercy, is the ſtreſs of the Argument, and is praying, adoring, relying upon him; acts of ſuch a nature, as

cannot

cannot without Blasphemy and Idolatry be offer'd to any but God.

Visibly, Can any thing more visibly infer the Omnipresence, and Omniscience of Christ than *Matt.* 18. 20. *Where two or three are gather'd together in my name, there am I in the midst of them*, Matt. 28. 20. *and lo I am with you always, even to the end of the World*, Mark 2. 8. *When Jesus perceiv'd in his spirit that they so reason'd within themselves, he say'd unto them, why reason ye these things in your hearts*, Joh. 2. 29. *he knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man, for he knew what was in man*, 1 Cor. 4. 5. *who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts*, Rev. 2. 23. *I am he who searches the reins, and hearts, and I will give to every one of you according to your works.* Compare these Texts with those by which God discovers his Divine qualifications to us, and you will be forc'd to acknowledge that they are not more full and home then these.

The answers to most of these Texts, as most of *Socinian* answers, are all fram'd to elude, and not to resolve the difficulty. They consist in a bad reason, and in a place of Scripture strangely misunderstood, and worse apply'd. The reason is, Brief Hist. *pag.* 44, and 36. that the knowledge of Christ which he has, or shall have of any one's secret thoughts is a revelation made to him by God, as it was also, and may be to other Prophets. The Text which right or wrong they repeat at every turn, is Revel. 1. 1. *The revelation of J.C. which God gave to him to shew to his servants.*

The reason is worth nothing; For God's revealing of men's thoughts to a Prophet, no not the fullest revelation that ever was made, can come up to that extent which belongs to none but God, *I am he who searches the reins and the hearts.* No instance in Scripture can be produc'd of this. Though God has been pleas'd to reveal to a Man, the thoughts of another

Man;

Man, 2 *King.* 6. 12. yet this was ever particular and declar'd that God did it then. None ever assum'd to himself *to make manifest the counsels of the hearts of all men.* It is so much God's Prerogative and Character, that by it he is known to us.

Their Explication of *Rev.* 1. 1. is as bad. They make it to suppose ignorance in *Christ*, whom we have prov'd to know all things, and is inconsistent with that Omniscience so clearly spoken of before. Had these Gentlemen vouchsaf'd to lend one Ear to the Fathers and to the latter Divines of the greatest reputation, they would have met with these judicious Observations on this Text. 1*st* It shews at most that whatsoever *Christ* knows, he knows it from the Father receiving his knowledge as he receives his Essence, that is, from Everlasting. 2*ly*, It proves that God reveals nothing to men, but by the intervention of *C. J.* the Eternal and only mediator between God and Man. 1 Tim. 3. 5. *in whom we have boldness and access with confidence by the faith of him.* Eph. 3. 12. *by whom we have access by faith into his Grace.* Rom. 5. 2. who is to us the fountain of all knowledge. For *no man hath seen God at any time, the only begotten Son of the Father he has declar'd him.* Joh. 1. 18. and v. 16. *and of his fullness we have all receiv'd.* The sence then of the Text is, that God has appointed in this, as in all other things, that men might come to God by him, and be inform'd of the future events lay'd in this Sacred Book. That that shews the solidity if this interpretation, is that no part of the Sacred Writings has clearer testimonies of the Divinity of our Saviour than this, and God will not contradict in the very first Verse what he has so plainly asserted afterwards. The very Text it self, if seriously consider'd, is a proof of *Christs* equality with God, by his being above Angels whose Ministery he so often commands in this Book, and above men who are call'd here his Servants,

vants, δοῦλοι αὐτῦ, *the ſervants of him*, Chriſt. No intelligent ſubſtance being above the Angelical or human, but the Divine.

I am afraid I have tir'd you, and will therefore draw to a Concluſion. If you take together all that has been ſay'd, I doubt not but that you will be ſatisfy'd that *Socinianiſm* is inconſiſtent with that revelation which God has made of himſelf. I have lay'd before you two ſorts of proofs. Very many of them are direct, and ſhew invincibly that *Chriſt* is God. The other are indirect, but yet of that force and clearneſs, that they make it evident that all this cannot be ſay'd of a creature how excellent ſoever, no Creature in the utmoſt extent of perfection imaginable, being capable of what the Scripture attributes to Chriſt.

The firſt reading of the *Socinian* Writings will impoſe upon an unwary Reader, the ſecond and third will have quite another effect, and diſcover an incredible weakneſs. They oppoſe a few miſunderſtood places to the ſtream of Scripture. Theſe they urge with obſtinacy, and inſtead of reducing theſe few Texts, to the vaſt many aſſertions of the Sacred Writers, and giving them that ſence which they are really capable of; They ſtrain and endeavour to reduce to them the whole body of Divine truths, than which nothing is more unjuſt or unſincere. In human diſputes ſuch a way of arguing would be laught out of doors. How much leſs is it to be ſuffer'd in a controverſy of ſo ſacred a nature as this is. They catch at *Moſes* being ſay'd to be a God to *Pharaoh*. At the Angels being call'd *Elohim*; At Magiſtrates having the name of *Gods* given them: And on this they build aſſertions which give the lye to the conſtant Doctrines of the Scriptures. They have rak't all that the ancient and modern Hereticks have blaſphem'd againſt the Faith; and this they boldly oppoſe to the decrees of the

the most ancient, most universal, and most venerable Councils, to the unanimous consent of the whole Christian World, to the writings of the pious and learned Fathers.

The holy *Jesus* is the same yesterday, to day, and for ever. His Church has been in possession above sixteen hundred years of adoring and praying to him. His infinite merits are the only comfort and security of dying sinners.. The Eternal word made Flesh has been all along the great object of our Faith, and we have to deal now with a sort of unreasonable men, who pretend to unravil all this, and lay the Divine Fabrick to the ground, *by mean shifts, poor evasions*, and by dilapidating plain Texts with endless and groundless Criticisms.

I hope that you will be just to your self, and make all the haste you can to return to the Faith. To deny the Lord that has bought us, is an execrable piece of ingratitude; and it is strange that people who read the Scripture with any share of humility and sincerity should fall into that excess. That God would open your Eyes, that you may see the glorious Gospel of his Son *J. C.* and give you Grace to subject whatsoever exalts it self in you against his knowledge and Service is the passionate wish of,

SIR,

Your humble, and Faithful Servant,

L.

FINIS.

THE Reader is humbly desir'd to excuse the Errors of the Press, by reason of my not being in Town.

BOOKS lately Printed for Thomas Bennet.

THE Lives of all the Princes of *Orange*, from *William* the Great, Founder of the Commonwealth of the *United Provinces*. Written in *French* by the Baron *Maurier*, in 1682: whose Father was Twenty Years Ambassador at the *Hague*. And Published at *Paris* by Order of the *French* King. To which is added the Life of His Present Majesty, King *William* the Third. By Mr. *Thomas Brown*. Together with each Prince's Head before his Life. Done from Original Draughts, by Mr. *Robert White*.

Mr. *Bossu*'s Treatise of the Epick Poem, containing Curious Reflections, very useful and necessary for the right Understanding and Judging of the excellency of *Homer* and *Virgil*: done into English, with some Reflections on Prince *Arthur*, by *W. S.* To which are added an Essay on Satyr, by Mr. *Dacier*, and a Treatise of Pastoral Poetry, by Monsieur *Fontanelle*.

Monsieur *Rapine*'s Reflections upon *Aristotle*'s Poetry, Englished by Mr. *Rymer*, together with some Reflections on our Modern Poets.

A Sermon Preach'd at *Whitehall*, on *Sunday Sept*: 8. 1695. being the Day of Thanksgiving for the taking of *Namur*. By *J. Adams*, A. M. Rector of St. *Alban*'s *Woodstreet*. Published by Order of the Lords Justices.

The Foolish Abuse, and Wise Use of Riches. A Sermon Preach'd in the Parish Church of *Bromsgrove*, in *Worcestershire*, *May* 1. 1695. By *Will. Talbot*, D. D. and Dean of *Worcester*.

Malebranch's

Malebranch's Treatiſe concerning the Search after Truth; the whole Work compleat: To which is added a Treatiſe of Nature and Grace, by the ſame Author; being a conſequence of his Principles contained in the Search. Together with *F. Malebranch*'s Defence againſt Mr. *De la Ville*, and ſeveral other Adverſaries. All Engliſhed by *T. Taylor*, M. A. of *Magdalen College*, and Printed at *Oxford*. In Folio.

A Voyage to the World, of *Des Cartes*. Engliſhed by *T. Taylor*, M. A. of *Magdalen-College*.

In the Preſs. Sermons upon ſeveral Occaſions, by *R. Meggot*, D. D. late Dean of *Winchester*.